1901.
NEW ZEALAND.

STAFFS OF SCHOOLS AND SALARIES OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

(REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE).

Laid upon the Table of both Houses of the General Assembly by Command of His Excellency.

COMMISSION.

To Michael Gilfedder, of Invercargill, Alexander Wilson Hogg, of Masterton, Frank Yates Lethbridge, of Bull's, and Thomas Mackenzie, of Dunedin, members of the House of Representatives; Samuel Luke, of Auckland, a member of the Education Board of the District of Auckland; Thomas Shailer Weston, of Christchurch, Chairman of the Education Board of the District of North Canterbury; Henry Hill, of Napier, and John Smith, of Blenheim, Inspectors of Schools; and William Davidson, of Mornington, and Ralph Duncan Stewart, of Auckland, schoolmasters: Greeting.

WHEREAS it is expedient that a Commission should be appointed to consider the best method of establishing a uniform scale of staff and salaries to be in force throughout the Colony of New Zealand, under which the number of teachers employed in public schools maintained under "The Education Act, 1877," having an equal number of children in average daily attendance, shall, as far as possible, be the same, and the teachers holding similar positions to one another shall, other things being equal, be paid equal salaries:

Now, therefore, I, Uchter John Mark, Earl of Ranfurly, the Governor of the Colony of New Zealand, in pursuance and exercise of all powers and authorities enabling me in this behalf, and by and with the advice and consent of the Executive Council of the said colony, do hereby appoint you, the said

MICHAEL GILFEDDER,
ALEXANDER WILSON HOGG,
FRANK YATES LETHBRIDGE,
THOMAS MACKENZIE,
SAMUEL LUKE,
THOMAS SHAILER WESTON,
HENRY HILL,
JOHN SMITH,
WILLIAM DAVIDSON, and
RALPH DUNCAN STEWART,

to be a Commission to inquire and report as to the principles upon which such uniform scale as aforesaid should be based, taking into consideration the total amount payable by the Government of the colony for such purposes as are

contemplated by the payments now made under subsection two of section eight of the said Act, the said amount not exceeding on the whole a sum equal to a capitation of four pounds per annum for each child in average daily attendance.

And generally by all lawful means to take such evidence and make such inquiry in the premises as you shall think expedient for the purposes aforesaid.

And, further, I do hereby appoint the said Alexander Wilson Hogg to be the Chairman of this Commission.

And I do hereby, and with the advice and consent aforesaid, require you, within forty days after the date of this Commission, or as much sooner as the same can conveniently be done (using all diligence), to certify to me under your hand and seal your several proceedings and your opinion touching the premises. And, with the like advice and consent, I do hereby declare that this Commission shall continue in full force and virtue, and that you, the said Commissioners, shall and may from time to time proceed in the execution thereof at such place or places and at such times as you shall judge convenient, and although the same be not continued from time to time by adjournment.

And, lastly, I do hereby declare that this Commission is and is intended to be issued subject to the provisions of "The Commissioners' Powers Act, 1867," and "The Commissioners' Powers Act Amendment Act, 1872."

Given under the hand of His Excellency the Right Honourable Uchter John Mark, Earl of Ranfurly; Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George; Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over His (L.S.) Majesty's Colony of New Zealand and its Dependencies; and issued under the Seal of the Colony, at the Government House, at Wellington, this ninth day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and one.

RANFURLY.

In Executive Council.

J. F. ANDREWS,
Acting-Clerk of the Executive Council.

GOD SAVE THE KING!

REPORT.

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Uchter John Mark, Earl of Ranfurly, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over His Majesty's Colony of New Zealand and its Dependencies, and Vice-Admiral of the same.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

We, the Commissioners appointed by the Commission of the 9th day of April, 1901, under the hand of your Excellency and the Seal of the Colony, for the purpose of considering the best method of establishing a uniform scale of staff and salaries to be in force throughout the Colony, under which the number of teachers employed in public schools maintained under "The Education Act, 1877," having an equal number of children in average daily attendance shall, as far as possible, be the same; and the teachers holding similar positions to one another shall, other things being equal, be paid equal salaries; and to report as to the principles upon which such uniform scale should be based, taking into consideration the total amount payable by the Government of the Colony for such purposes as are contemplated by the payments now made under subsection (2) of section 8 of the said Act, the said amount not exceeding on the whole a sum equal to a capitation of £4 per annum for each child in average daily attendance, have now the honour to report to your Excellency as follows:—

1. EVIDENCE.

For the purpose of obtaining evidence upon the matters committed to us, we caused advertisements to be inserted in the newspapers circulating in the localities we proposed to visit, inviting those desirous of giving information to appear before us. Sittings were held at Wellington, Blenheim, Nelson, Greymouth, Hokitika, Christchurch, Dunedin, Invercargill, Timaru, Auckland, New Plymouth, Wanganui, and Napier, and every publicity was given, the meetings being held with open doors.

During our inquiries thirty-eight sittings of the Commission were held, in addition to numerous meetings of Committees. We examined 150 witnesses, including the Inspector-General of Schools, Chairmen, Secretaries, and Members of Education Boards, Members of School Committees, Inspectors of Schools, Teachers, and others. The evidence, oral and otherwise, elicited during the inquiry is attached hereto.

The first witness examined was Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., Secretary for Education and Inspector-General of Schools, who placed before us a scale of staffs and salaries drafted by himself. This scale was, at the request of the Commission, immediately distributed by the Education Department among the teachers and members of Boards and School Committees throughout the Colony. During the inquiry several draft scales were submitted, and finally five were under consideration. Of these, Exhibit 2 is the scale put in by Mr. Hogben; Exhibits 50 and 107 show the same scale in an amended form; Exhibit 110 is a scale also drafted by Mr. Hogben, differing from the others by omitting deductions from salaries in connection with certificates, and requiring a capitation grant of £4 5s. The fifth scale was presented by a member of the Commission.

2. THE NECESSITY FOR A COLONIAL SCALE.

The necessity for the adoption of a colonial scale arises from conditions connected with the administration of primary education in the colony. The Department of Education distributes to the Boards the capitation voted by Parliament, and each Board frames its own regulations relating to the staffs and salaries of the schools. Given thirteen districts and thirteen schemes, we are invited to bring into harmony widely divergent interests and conditions—a task, it must be admitted, presenting some difficulty.

The Boards have frequently found it necessary, for financial and other reasons, to change their regulations; and it is hard to say how many different scales have been in operation since the Boards were constituted. The evidence taken shows that, as a general result of these changes, the salaries of teachers throughout the Colony are steadily falling,

while statistics prove that in other parts of the British Empire the change is in the opposite direction. In support of the latter statement we quote the report of the Board of Education, England, for the year 1900: "The average salary of a certificated master has risen, since 1874, 35 per cent., and of a certificated mistress nearly 48 per cent." In New Zealand, on the other hand, it is shown in the annual report of the Minister of Education for the same year that the average salaries paid to teachers have fallen.

We are convinced that discontent exists among the great majority of teachers, but whether the adoption of a colonial scale of staff and salaries will completely remove this feeling remains to be seen. Among the reasons urged in favour of a colonial scale are the following:—

(1.) The great inequalities existing in the payment of salaries in schools of the same class;

(2.) The disproportionate allotment of salaries in individual districts;

(3.) The frequent reductions in salaries;

(4.) The increasing cost of maintenance of small schools.

Although the Government has paid the same capitation allowance to Boards, it does not follow that equal justice has been meted to them. Thus, in the Westland District there are thirty-six schools with a combined average attendance of 1,139, or an average of 31·6 pupils in each school. On the existing capitation of £3 15s. the amount payable to the Board is £4,271 5s., which for each school averages £118 13s. In the adjoining district of North Canterbury the average number of pupils to each school is 83·75, representing on the same basis an income of £324 1s. 3d. The scale of staff and salaries submitted herewith shows that a small school costs relatively much more than a large one. This enables certain Boards to pay higher salaries to their teachers than can be paid in districts where the average number of pupils in each school is small.

In order to make this point clear we give the range of salaries at rates paid in 1899. This is quoted from the statement that forms part of Exhibit 2:—

Average Attendance.	Range of Salary.
20	£70 to £115
100	£160 to £225
250	£203 to £275
600	£258 to £375

In order to equalise the salaries of teachers that are in charge of schools with the same average attendance, it is necessary either to give higher capitation to small districts such as Westland, Grey, and Marlborough, or, for salary purposes, to regard the schools of the colony as belonging to a single district. In the latter case the income by way of capitation must be so allotted to the teachers that the same salary will be paid to every teacher in schools of the same size. Any further attempt to secure equality is impracticable, although much evidence was given respecting the varying cost of living in different parts of the colony, and even in different parts of the same education district. On the whole, the members of the Commission consider that, though in the past this difference was very considerable, it is not sufficient to require at the present time special recognition, and the rapid improvement in the means of transit will still further reduce whatever inequality may at present exist.

It is generally conceded that the Boards have used the funds placed at their disposal to the best advantage. The grant of £3 15s. for each pupil in average attendance being found to be inadequate, the Boards received from 1878 to 1887, inclusive, "special capitation allowances" of from 4s. to 10s. towards the expenses of School Committees. Since the latter year no capitation beyond the £3 15s. has been paid. Notwithstanding that the commercial, economic, and social conditions of New Zealand have compelled Boards to extend their work in various directions, the capitation grant for teachers' salaries and allowances to School Committees, &c., remains practically the same as in 1878. The insufficiency of the grant of £3 15s. is conceded by your Excellency's Commission, which requires us to prepare a colonial scale of salaries based on a payment of £4 per annum for each child in average daily attendance.

3. Proposed Scales of Staffs and Salaries.

Before proceeding to refer in detail to the scales of salaries formulated by us, and to explain the principles upon which they are based, it is necessary to note a somewhat uncertain factor—namely, the sum to be set aside to meet the cost of administration by Boards, allowances to School Committees, inspection, "sick-pay," supply service, and minor charges. Variations exist throughout the Colony in the rates of payment for these purposes similar to those presented in scales of staffs and salaries. The average expenditure incurred in Boards' expenses for the last three years was £62,150 per annum. We find that several Boards have—more especially in former years—devoted a portion of the capitation grant to the erection and repairs of school-buildings. This necessarily reduced the amount available for salaries. The majority of Boards now, however, consider that this allowance should not be expended on school-buildings. We hold that such transfers from the General Account to the Building Fund are unjustifiable, and should be discontinued.

In making provision for the fund for purposes other than the payment of teachers' salaries we have adopted the suggestion of the Inspector-General of Schools. By this suggestion £250 is allowed to each Board, with a capitation of 11s. 3d. on the total average attendance of the schools of the district. The sum required will be £66,108. By the fixed payment the financial position of the smaller districts will be strengthened, while the total increase will prove beneficial in all cases.

According to an estimate prepared by the Secretary for Education the income available, based on the returns of the year 1900, is £450,990, composed of: (1) a capitation of £4 on 111,747·5 pupils, equalling £446,990; (2) inspection subsidy to be merged with (1), £4,000: a total of £450,990. If from this sum is deducted £66,108—allowances to Boards—there is left on which to base the necessary calculations for the construction of a scale of staffs and salaries the amount £384,882.

Two schemes have been prepared, and these are marked Scale No. 1 and Scale No. 2 respectively, and appear as Appendices A and B. They present the same general features, the difference between them being that in the second there is an increase in the amount proposed as salaries to teachers in schools with an average attendance of more than 20. We strongly recommend the adoption of Scale No. 2. As, however, the order of reference necessitates the construction of a scale on a capitation of £4, we are compelled to so reduce salaries as to bring the total expenditure within the amount available. This, as has been stated, is £384,882, while the cost for salaries is, under Scale No. 1, £384,764, and under Scale No. 2 £395,616, leaving an unallotted balance of £118 in the former, and a debit balance of £13,425 in the latter.

We urge that the amount to be voted for the payment of teachers' salaries and Boards' allowances be raised to a sum equal to a capitation of £4 2s. 6d. There would then be sufficient funds to provide for the requirements of Scale No. 2, and to increase the allowances of Boards to a capitation of 12s., with the addition of £250 to each district with an average attendance not exceeding 8,000—a provision we estimate to be sufficient. The adoption of this course would, in our opinion, satisfy the requirements of Boards and teachers, and, from an educational point of view, result in increased efficiency in the primary schools.

4. Notes on the Proposed Scales.

We supply notes on the chief features and principles presented by the proposed scales. The numbers used are from the returns of the last quarter of the year 1900, that being the year on the returns of which the estimate of the expenditure under the scales was made.

Scale No. 1 gives a suggested staffing of schools of an attendance from 1 to 1,050. The latter limit has been found necessary in order to provide for schools already established in the larger centres. We think, however, that for many reasons it is undesirable to foster the growth of very large schools. The maximum number of pupils should not exceed 700, representing an average attendance varying from 600 to 650, and we suggest that in future that limit should be adopted. We make this recommendation to obviate the duplication of classes and the establishment of separate departments. It is our opinion that the mixed school, moderate in size, represents the highest type of the primary school.

Both scales provide for a grant of £5 up to an average attendance of 20. Under this proposal the Boards will be enabled to make complete provision for education in isolated and sparsely populated districts. For schools of this grade the grants made by Boards have varied in rate. Some Boards have refused to sanction the establishment of a school

unless an attendance of at least 10 children of school-age could be guaranteed, while others have paid a subsidy for a single child. In the majority of districts, including the smaller, the opinion was almost unanimous that a capitation of £5 is a sufficiently liberal allowance. According to the latest returns, the total average attendance in schools of this grade is 6,314, and £31,570 will be absorbed in salaries, irrespective of the cost of maintenance.

In schools of the second grade, with an average attendance varying from 20 to 30, the salaries are the same for teachers of both sexes. The question of "equal pay for equal work" to men and women formed a prominent feature in the evidence taken by us, and on this subject widely different views were expressed. While some women teachers claimed equal pay with men, others thought they were, for economic reasons, not entitled to the same remuneration, although they held that the disparity in salaries had hitherto been too great. It was agreed, however, that women in many instances do not receive payment commensurate with the work they perform. Members of the Commission, though divided on the question of granting equal pay to men and women, unite in thinking that under existing circumstances the principle cannot be fully applied. It has, however, been adopted as far as relates to all schools with an average attendance not exceeding 30, and above this number the salaries of women teachers have been raised to approximate more closely to those paid to male teachers in similar positions. In this grade (20 to 30) there are 323 schools, and the capitation allowance will, on each unit of increase over 20, be at the rate of £3 10s. under Scale No. 1 and £4 under Scale No. 2. The salaries will therefore range from £103 10s. to £135 and from £104 to £140 under the two scales respectively. These schools will absorb in salaries approximately £38,114 according to scale No. 1, and according to scale No. 2 £39,719.

In the third grade of schools, consisting of those with an average attendance of over 30 and not over 40, a differential scale begins. The increase for each unit is at the rate of £2 for men and £1 for women. By this proposal the salary for a master ranges from £135 to £155 under Scale No. 1, and from £140 to £160 under Scale No. 2; while the salary for mistresses varies from £135 to £145 under the former scale, and from £140 to £150 under the latter.

In the three grades of schools now considered provision is made for nearly five-eighths of the primary schools—namely, 1,039 out of a total of 1,674—and we have so far dealt with schools in charge of a sole teacher. Our aim has been to provide salaries likely to attract teachers of increased capacity and training, and, although the salaries paid to men and women respectively differ slightly, both sexes are placed practically on the same competitive terms.

In the grade 40 to 50 under Scale No. 1, the salary of the head-teacher varies for men from £155 to £165, and for women from £145 to £150. In Scale No. 2, £5 is added to the salary of each teacher.

A new feature is now presented by the introduction into the staff of an assistant teacher. Several Boards have not recognised the necessity for the grant of assistance until the average attendance has reached 45, and even 50, and when help has been supplied it has usually taken the form of a pupil-teacher. We regard it as indispensable that the first addition to the staff should be a duly qualified assistant. Therefore, so soon as the average attendance exceeds 40, an assistant mistress is to be appointed, at a salary commencing at £80 per annum. At this point, however, we undoubtedly prefer the allotment of a minimum salary of £85, as provided in Scale No. 2.

In both scales the salaries of all assistants are fixed at each grade, and do not vary, as in the case of head-teachers, with each unit of increase or decrease in the average attendance. For example, the assistant in a school in the grade 50 to 70 will receive £85 per annum, while in the succeeding grade her salary will be £100.

The schools between 50 and 90 number 232, and the cost of staffing each school varies from £250 to £315. This, we are aware, is somewhat costly, but we deem it important that provision should be made for securing the highest degree of efficiency in the country schools.

Of the 1,674 primary schools, 1,411 have an average attendance not exceeding 90. Of these the total average attendance is 34,143, and the total salaries approximately £167,671 under Scale No. 1, and £172,276 under Scale No. 2. The average attendance of the remaining 263 schools varies from 91 to 1,020, and in only one school reaches 1,000.

The staff is increased at 90 by the addition of a pupil-teacher, and at 120 by a second pupil-teacher. Between 150 and 330 the increase is made by appointing an assistant alternately with a pupil-teacher, the advance required being 50 for an assistant and 30 for a pupil-teacher. Above 330, while the same alternation is preserved, the addition required to secure an assistant is raised to 60.

The supply of male teachers to fill the positions available on the staffs of the primary schools is at present inadequate. On reference, however, to the explanatory notes at the foot of Scales Nos. 1 and 2, it will be seen that great latitude has been allowed to Boards in the choice of teachers of either sex, and in other special arrangements of the school staff.

The maximum salary set down in Scale No. 1 for the largest class of schools is £374, and in Scale No. 2, £380, exclusive of house allowance. These salaries are less than those paid to headmasters in many primary schools of England and Scotland. Taking into consideration, however, the needs of country districts and the inadvisableness of encouraging the establishment of large schools, we have not fixed a higher rate in such positions. The number of schools of more than 700 pupils is six, while in only two cases will the headmasters be entitled to the maximum salaries.

It may be here stated that, while either of the scales submitted will benefit the large majority of teachers and schools in the Colony, more particularly in the smaller districts, it has been found impossible, especially under Scale No. 1, to avoid reducing a few salaries. Several Boards have, at certain points in the scales now in force, adopted payments higher than those allotted in other districts, and higher than can possibly be given according to a general scheme. Where, however, a salary paid according to the scale in force on 30th June, 1901, is more than that of the colonial scale, we recommend that the reduction shall not take effect until the close of a period of two years, unless in the meantime there is a change of teacher. Details of staffs and salaries in the various grades of schools under Scale No. 1 and Scale No. 2 are presented in a table (Appendix G).

It is necessary to provide that before any alteration in staff, by increase or decrease, can take place the average attendance calling for such alteration must have been maintained for at least two consecutive quarters. We consider, however, that power should be retained, in any case of decrease under exceptional circumstances, and on the recommendation of an Education Board, to defer the action of such regulation for a third quarter.

5. House Allowance.

The scales we have the honour to place before your Excellency deal solely with staffs and salaries, and take no account of the rental value of school residences occupied by many head-teachers. Excluding from our consideration the 488 schools where the average attendance does not exceed 20, there are 835 schools with, and 351 without, residences. If the colonial scale of staffs and salaries has for its aim the equalisation of payment, it is evident that the head-teachers of the 351 schools are not on the same line of equality with those provided with dwellings. The cost of the existing residences has, we assume, been defrayed out of the annual grant for buildings. To take, therefore, from the capitation grant sufficient money to provide house allowance would, in our opinion, be wrong. For this reason we recommend that where no residence is provided house allowance be paid from the Building Fund on the following scale: Over 20 and not over 50 in average attendance, £20; over 50 and not over 150, £30; over 150 and not over 250, £35; over 250 and not over 420, £40; over 420, £50. It is necessary to explain that the salaries of head-teachers are suggested as adequate only if a residence is granted or rent allowed. The estimated annual cost of special provision for house allowance in connection with the 351 schools referred to is approximately £8,000.

6. Teachers' Certificates.

While not prepared to adopt a general system of deductions for deficiencies in certificates, we recommend that the salaries of uncertificated head-teachers and assistants be reduced 10 per cent., provided that such salaries do not in consequence fall below £80 per annum.

The evidence indicates that many teachers and other educationists are opposed to the schemes of certificates at present in vogue. We think that it is unduly complicated, and should be simplified by a reduction in the number of classes and divisions. The issue of two grades of certificates of competency to manage and teach a primary school is all that

the public interests demand. Length of service and the reports of Inspectors furnish sufficient additional data upon which Boards may base their estimation of the capabilities of teachers. The holders of literary qualifications higher than those recorded in the suggested certificates may obtain official recognition of the same by passing university examinations. It is therefore unnecessary that the department should issue to a graduate of the university a diploma higher than the present C certificate.

7. Scale for Special Schools.

There are a few schools that do not conform to the type of mixed school to which we have already made reference. In certain districts there are separate schools for infants, girls, or boys. We have presented (Appendix C) a scale of staffs and salaries for these when they exceed 200 in average attendance. The number of schools coming under this scale is only six, and we are unanimous in the opinion that these should, without delay, be brought into line with the other schools of the Colony. In the case of a side-school that is carried on as a branch of a main school, it is sufficient, we think, if the staffing be allotted on the combined average attendance of the two schools, with extra provision such as the substitution of an assistant for a pupil-teacher.

8. The Teaching Staff.

At the present time the teachers in the schools of the colony may be classed as—Head or sole teachers; infant mistresses; heads of departments; assistants; ex-pupil-teachers; pupil-teachers; sewing-mistresses. Under the proposed schemes only three classes are recognised — namely, head or sole teachers, assistants, and pupil-teachers. In all schools where there are assistants the head-teacher is the controlling authority, and is responsible for the organization of the whole school. To use the terms "head of department" or "infant mistress" is liable to lead to a wrong conception of the positions of such officers in relation to the head-teacher, to whom every member of the staff should be amenable for direction in carrying on the work of either class or department.

In several education districts it is usual to appoint sewing-mistresses to small schools in charge of male teachers. The salary paid to the sewing-mistresses is in many cases nominal, as the time occupied in this service does not amount to more than two or three hours a week. We carefully considered the probable effect of the abolition of this position, and are satisfied that the result will be beneficial, as the increase in salaries will attract into the smaller schools teachers capable of providing for instruction in sewing and at the same time supplying a higher standard of general training.

9. The Pupil-teacher System.

We are in accord with a number of witnesses who consider that the least satisfactory part of primary education in New Zealand is the pupil-teacher system. This objection does not go so far as a recommendation of its abolition at the present time, and we confine ourselves to suggestions for important modifications.

A great want of uniformity is disclosed in the selection, appointment, instruction, and examination of pupil-teachers. The most important point brought under our notice relates to the Entrance Examination. This varies from a pass for the Sixth Standard to the Matriculation Examination, and the age of admission displays corresponding variations. It is found in all districts, however, that there is considerable reluctance on the part of boys to enter the profession, and the chief reason assigned for this is the long and arduous apprenticeship at a low remuneration.

The scales submitted show a reduction in the number of pupil-teachers from 962 to 681. This reduction can be effected gradually as opportunity occurs, so that pupil-teachers already in the service may not be prejudicially affected. The payment proposed is equal to the highest now allowed by any Board, and the duty of giving instruction to pupil-teachers has been allotted to the head-teacher and assistants without special remuneration. We think, further, that the qualifications required for entrance should be greater than a mere pass in the highest standard of the primary course; that the age of candidates should be raised; that, if possible, the period of apprenticeship should be shortened; and that a uniform system of examination should be instituted. If the age and qualifications required at entrance are not raised, the question arises whether in this colony, as under the

London, Glasgow, Birmingham, and other School Boards of Great Britain, pupil-teachers should be required to engage in the instruction of pupils for only half of each day, devoting the remainder to study.

10. Training-schools.

A matter of still greater importance, although perhaps beyond the scope of our inquiry, is the training of teachers during the period immediately following the pupil-teacher course. The only institutions at present established for this purpose are the Normal Schools in Christchurch and Dunedin, and a Training-school in Napier. Each of these includes a primary school with special arrangements for the training of teachers. The Normal Schools undertake, in addition, instruction in literary subjects for the departmental examinations. This appears to us to be superfluous in centres provided with university colleges. It is sufficient that training-schools should confine themselves to the preparation of students in the art of teaching, in the principles on which methods are based, and in subjects that require manual training and practical exercise, such as drawing, music, drill, and handwork. What are required, in short, are technical schools for teachers. These should be established in each of the chief centres by removing the pupil-teachers from the staff of an ordinary primary school and substituting a certain number of ex-pupil-teachers who have qualified themselves by success in examination and by satisfactory progress in the art of teaching in its elementary stages. This scheme would be comparatively inexpensive, as the extra cost would be, in some cases at least, confined to the payment of such students at a salary of, say, £60 per annum, less the sum set down in the scale for the pupil-teachers that are replaced. More advanced instruction in theory might well be left to lecturers on the science of education in connection with university colleges.

Whether or not the scheme here outlined is adopted, it is essential that increased provision be made for the training of teachers, as upon this depends to a large extent the efficiency of our primary schools, which supply for nine-tenths of the population the only means of education, and which form the chief basis not only of the progress of secondary education, but also of social, moral, and economic conditions. The greatness of a country is founded on the right upbringing of its children, and the schools, whose first care this is, depend for their power for good upon the character, skill, and intelligence of the teachers. We urge, therefore, that hardly any sacrifice is too great for the colony to make on behalf of the sound training of its young teachers. The nobler the influences and the greater the intelligence brought to bear on true education the higher will be the ideals of private life and citizenship of the men and women of the future.

11. Conclusion.

We have now dealt with the most salient points bearing upon the primary schools. Our purpose has been to bring into view what benefit will accrue to the public-school teachers and to education generally from a colonial scheme, and how that scheme will affect directly and indirectly the work of Boards. We admit that the division of the Colony into education districts has materially assisted in the spread of primary education. The independence enjoyed by Boards has enabled them to adapt their schools to the special conditions and requirements of districts. Noting the good work that has been done, we have endeavoured to so guard the introduction of a colonial scheme that the influence of Boards will in no way suffer. The evidence accompanying our report is full of suggestions bearing on the success of the primary schools. Some of these we can merely mention, as they form subjects for separate inquiry. We refer to the control of Inspectors, the appointment, transference, and promotion of teachers, besides such subjects as superannuation of teachers, compassionate allowances to representatives of deceased teachers, truancy, scholarships, and the amalgamation of certain education districts. The valuable evidence that was given by members and secretaries of Education Boards stands as a monument of their earnestness and capacity in fostering the interests of the primary schools. So, too, the evidence of teachers shows that Boards have not been unmindful of the importance of selecting men and women of intelligence and wide influence for good.

Should the colonial scale advocated by us be approved, we feel confident that the event will mark an era in the history of primary education in New Zealand. Teachers and children will be alike benefited—teachers by the improvement of their social status; children by the higher influences that must follow the gradual replacement of pupil-teachers by capable assistants and the general advance in the efficiency of the teaching staff as a

result of increased remuneration. We cannot do more than hope that our labours will result in fostering the work of primary education along the lines laid down in the Act of 1877.

As the result of our inquiries and deliberations, we, with great respect, advise your Excellency :—

1. That Scale No. 1 comes within a £4 capitation.
2. That Scale No. 2, estimated on a £4 2s. 6d. capitation, fulfils conditions that will, in our opinion, greatly benefit primary education. Therefore we strongly recommend its adoption.
3. That the scale come into operation on the 1st day of January, 1902.
4. That, as stated in the body of the report, two years be allowed for adjustment of salaries in certain cases.
5. That a modification in the system of the certificates of teachers be adopted.
6. That the pupil-teacher system be amended.
7. That training-schools for teachers be established, and that, pending the introduction of a general scheme, existing institutions receive special consideration.

Finally, we acknowledge in the warmest manner the invaluable information, counsel, and help supplied by the Secretary for Education and the officers of his department; the assistance freely accorded by the Chairmen and officers of the several Education Boards; the evidence furnished by representatives of the various branches of the New Zealand Educational Institute, and by other witnesses; and the ability and the untiring devotion of the Secretary to the Commission, Mr. A. J. Morton, B.A.:

All which is respectfully submitted for the consideration of your Excellency.

As witness our hands and seals, at Wellington, this 29th day of July, 1901.

(L.S.) A. W. Hogg, Chairman.
(L.S.) Wm. Davidson.
(L.S.) Ralph D. Stewart.
(L.S.) Thos. Mackenzie.
(L.S.) T. S. Weston.
(L.S.) H. Hill.
(L.S.) Samuel Luke.
(L.S.) John Smith.
(L.S.) M. Gilfedder.
(L.S.) Frank Y. Lethbridge.

APPENDIX "A"

Scale No. 1.—A SUGGESTED COLONIAL SCALE OF STAFFS AND SALARIES.

Grade of School	Average Attendance.	Head or Sole Teacher. Male. Fixed. £	Male. Capitation* s.	Female. Fixed. £	Female. Capitation* s.	Assistants. First Female Assistant. £	M £	F £	M £	F £	M £	F £	M £	F £	M £	F £	M £	F £	M £	F £	M £	F £	M £	F £	M £	F £	Pupil Teach'rs
1	Not over 20	...	100	...	100																						
2	Over 20 and not over 30	100	70	100	70																						
3	„ 30 „ 40	135	40	135	20	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
4	„ 40 „ 50	155	20	145	10	80	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
5	„ 50 „ 70	165	25	150	10	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
6	„ 70 „ 90	190	25	160	10	95	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
7	„ 90 „ 120	215	6	170	3	100	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1
8	„ 120 „ 150	224	6	174½	3	105	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2
9	„ 150 „ 200	233	6	179	3	110	80	80	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2
10	„ 200 „ 250	248	6	186½	3	115	155	125	80	80	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	2
11	„ 250 „ 280	263	6	194	3	120	170	135	85	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3
12	„ 280 „ 330	272	4	198½	2	125	185	145	100	100	80	80	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3
13	„ 330 „ 390	282	4	203½	2	130	195	155	105	105	100	100	80	80	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3
14	„ 390 „ 420	294	4	209½	2	135	205	165	110	105	100	100	85	80	..	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4
15	„ 420 „ 480	300	4	212½	2	140	220	175	120	110	105	105	100	100	80	80	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4
16	„ 480 „ 510	312	4	218½	2	145	235	185	125	110	110	110	105	105	80	80	...	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	5
17	„ 510 „ 570	318	4	221½	&c.	150	235	185	130	115	110	110	110	105	105	95	80	80	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	5
18	„ 570 „ 600	330	4	&c.		155	235	185	130	115	115	115	110	105	105	95	80	80	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	6
19	„ 600 „ 660	336	4			165	235	185	130	115	120	120	115	110	110	100	85	80	80	80	...	...	...	...	...	..	6
20	„ 660 „ 690	348	2			175	240	190	145	120	130	130	120	115	115	110	90	85	80	80	...	...	...	...	...	...	7
21	„ 690 „ 750	351	2			185	240	190	155	125	140	140	125	120	120	115	95	90	90	85	80	80	...	...	...	...	7
22	„ 750 „ 780	357	2			195	240	190	165	130	150	150	130	125	125	120	105	95	95	90	80	80	...	...	...	...	8
23	„ 780 „ 840	360	2			205	245	195	165	130	155	155	130	125	125	120	105	95	95	90	80	80	80	80	...	...	8
24	„ 840 „ 870	366	2			205	245	195	165	130	155	155	130	125	125	120	105	95	95	90	80	80	80	80	..	..	9
25	„ 870 „ 930	368	2			205	245	195	165	130	155	155	135	130	130	125	110	100	100	95	85	85	80	80	80	80	9
26	„ 930 „ 960	374	...			205	245	195	170	135	155	155	135	130	130	125	110	100	100	95	85	85	80	80	80	80	10
27	„ 960 „ 1020	374	...			205	245	195	170	135	155	155	135	130	130	125	110	100	100	95	85	85	85	85	80	80	10
28	„ 1020 „ 1050	374	...			205	245	195	170	135	155	155	135	130	130	125	110	100	100	95	85	85	85	85	80	80	11

Salaries of Pupil Teachers.

46290

First year, £20, with allowance of £10 if obliged to live away from home. | Third year, £40, with allowance of £5 if obliged to live away from home.
Second year, £30, „ „ £10 „ „ „ | Fourth year, £50, „ „ £5 „ „ „

A fifth year pupil teacher continuing in the same school shall receive the remuneration of a third year pupil teacher; but otherwise, or if he has passed the examination for a teacher's certificate, he shall receive the salary of a fourth year pupil teacher.

(*a*) The number of male assistants must not exceed the number of female assistants (including the First Female Assistant).
(*b*) At least three out of the first six assistants in any school above 510 (exclusive of the First Female Assistant) must be females.
(*c*) An assistant at £80 may be substituted for two pupil-teachers.
(*d*) Two pupil-teachers may be substituted for an assistant.
(*e*) Instead of an assistant, two pupil-teachers may be employed, £45 being added to the salary of another assistant.
(*f*) Instead of adding a pupil-teacher, a Board may add £35 to the salary of an assistant.
(*g*) Only one of the changes (*d*), (*e*) and (*f*), shall be allowed in schools not over 420, and only two in schools over 420.
(*h*) The total number of pupil-teachers in any Education District must not be increased by such changes as (*d*), (*e*) and (*f*) above the number allowed for such district by the scale.
(*i*) Any certificated teacher on the staff of a school in which pupil teachers are employed may be required, without extra payment, to take part in the instruction of such pupil teachers.

APPENDIX "B"

Scale No. 2.—A SUGGESTED COLONIAL SCALE OF STAFFS AND SALARIES.

Grade of School	Average Attendance	Head or Sole Teacher				Assistants																				Pupil Teach'r
		Male.		Female.		First Female Assistant																				
		Fixed	Capitation	Fixed	Capitation		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
		£	s.	£	s.	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
1	Not over ... 20	...	100	...	100	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
2	Over 20 and not over 30	100	80	100	80	90	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
3	„ 30 „ 40	140	40	140	20	100	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
4	„ 40 „ 50	160	20	150	10	105	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
5	„ 50 „ 70	170	25	155	10	110	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
6	„ 70 „ 90	195	25	165	10	115	85	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1
7	„ 90 „ 120	220	6	175	3	120	160	130	85	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2
8	„ 120 „ 150	229	6	179½	3	125	175	140	90	90	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2
9	„ 150 „ 200	238	6	184	3	130	190	150	105	105	85	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2
10	„ 200 „ 250	253	6	191½	3	135	200	160	110	110	105	105	85	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3
11	„ 250 „ 280	268	6	199	3	140	210	170	115	110	105	105	90	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3
12	„ 280 „ 330	277	4	203½	2	145	225	180	125	115	110	110	105	105	85	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4
13	„ 330 „ 390	287	4	208½	2	150	240	190	130	115	115	115	110	110	85	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4
14	„ 390 „ 420	299	4	214½	2	155	240	190	135	120	115	115	115	110	110	100	85	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5
15	„ 420 „ 480	305	4	217½	2	160	240	190	135	120	120	120	115	110	110	100	85	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5
16	„ 480 „ 510	317	4	223½	2	170	240	190	135	120	125	125	120	115	115	105	90	85	85	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	6
17	„ 510 „ 570	323	4	226½	2	180	245	195	150	130	135	135	125	120	120	115	95	90	85	85	...	...	...	...	...	...	6
18	„ 570 „ 600	335	4	&c.	2	190	245	195	165	140	145	145	130	125	125	120	100	95	95	90	85	85	...	...	...	...	7
19	„ 600 „ 660	341	4	&c.	2	200	245	195	180	150	155	155	135	130	130	125	110	100	100	95	85	85	...	...	...	...	7
20	„ 660 „ 690	353	2		&c.	210	250	200	190	160	160	160	135	130	130	125	110	100	100	95	85	85	...	...	...	...	8
21	„ 690 „ 750	356	2			210	250	200	190	160	160	160	135	130	130	125	110	100	100	95	85	85	85	85	...	...	8
22	„ 750 „ 780	362	2			210	250	200	190	160	160	160	135	130	130	125	110	100	100	95	85	85	85	85	...	...	9
23	„ 780 „ 840	365	2			210	250	200	190	160	160	160	140	135	135	130	115	105	105	100	90	90	85	85	85	85	9
24	„ 840 „ 870	371	2			210	250	200	190	160	160	160	140	135	135	130	115	105	105	100	90	90	85	85	85	85	10
25	„ 870 „ 930	374	2			210	250	200	190	160	160	160	140	135	135	130	115	105	105	100	90	90	90	90	85	85	10
26	„ 930 „ 960	380				210	250	200	190	160	160	160	140	135	135	130	115	105	105	100	90	90	90	90	85	85	11
27	„ 960 „ 1020	380																									
28	„ 1020 „ 1050	380																									

46290

Salaries of Pupil-Teachers.

First year, £20, with allowance of £10 if obliged to live away from home. | Third year, £40, with allowance of £5 if obliged to live away from home.
Second year, £30, „ £10 „ | Fourth year, £50, „ £5 „

A fifth year pupil teacher continuing in the same school shall receive the remuneration of a third year pupil teacher; but otherwise, or if he has passed the examination for a teacher's certficate, he shall receive the salary of a fourth year pupil teacher.

(*a*) The number of male assistants must not exceed the number of female assistants (including the First Female Assistant).
(*b*) At least three out of the first six assistants in any school above 510 (exclusive of First Female Assistant) must be female assistants.
(*c*) An assistant at £85 may be substituted for two pupil-teachers.
(*d*) Two pupil-teachers may be substituted for an assistant.
(*e*) Instead of an assistant two pupil-teachers may be employed, £45 being added to the salary of another assistant.
(*f*) Instead of adding a pupil-teacher, a Board may add £35 to the salary of an assistant.
(*g*) Only one of the changes (*d*), (*e*) and (*f*) will be allowed in schools not over 420, and only two in schools over 420.
(*h*) The total number of pupil-teachers in any Education District must not be increased by such changes as (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*) above the number allowed for such district by the scale.
(*i*) Any certificated teacher on the staff of a school in which pupil teachers are employed may be required, without extra payment, to take part in the instruction of such pupil-teachers.

APPENDIX C.

(To accompany Scales No. 1 and No. 2.)

SUPPLEMENTARY SCALE for separate BOYS', GIRLS', and INFANT SCHOOLS.—SCHOOLS 201–600.

* Boys' Schools.										* Girls' Schools.								Infant Schools.								
Assistants.									Pupil-teachers.	Assistants.							Pupil-teachers.	Head Teacher.	Assistants.						Pupil-teachers.
201	250	190	150	120					2	140	110	90					2	165	125	90	85				2
251	280	200	155	125					3	150	115	100					3	175	130	90	85				3
281	330	205	160	125	100				3	155	120	105	85				3	180	140	100	90	85			3
331	390	210	160	130	105	85			3	160	120	110	90	85			3	185	145	110	100	90	85		3
391	420	215	165	130	105	85			4	165	125	110	95	85			4	190	150	115	105	95	85		4
421	480	220	165	135	110	90	85		4	170	125	115	95	85	85		4	195	150	115	105	95	90	85	4
481	510	225	170	135	110	90	85		5	175	130	115	100	85	85		5	200	155	120	110	100	95	85	5
511	570	230	170	140	115	100	90	85	5	180	130	120	100	90	85	85	5	205	155	120	110	100	95	90	85	5
571	600	235	175	140	115	100	90	85	6	185	135	120	105	90	85	85	6	210	160	125	115	105	100	95	85	6

* Salary for Head Teachers as under Scale 2. Should Scale No. 1 be adopted, the salaries in above scale must each be reduced by £5.

APPENDIX D.

Scale of Staff for Nos. 1 and 2.

Average Attendance.	Head Teacher.	Assistants.	Pupil-teachers.	Number of Teachers.
Not over 20	1	...	...	1
Over 20 not over 30	1	...	...	1
„ 30 „ 40	1	...	...	1
„ 40 „ 50	1	1	...	2
„ 50 „ 70	1	1	...	2
„ 70 „ 90	1	1	...	2
„ 90 „ 120	1	1	1	3
„ 120 „ 150	1	1	2	4
„ 150 „ 200	1	2	2	5
„ 200 „ 250	1	3	2	6
„ 250 „ 280	1	3	3	7
„ 280 „ 330	1	4	3	8
„ 330 „ 390	1	5	3	9
„ 390 „ 420	1	5	4	10
„ 420 „ 480	1	6	4	11
„ 480 „ 510	1	6	5	12
„ 510 „ 570	1	7	5	13
„ 570 „ 600	1	7	6	14
„ 600 „ 660	1	8	6	15
„ 660 „ 690	1	8	7	16
„ 690 „ 750	1	9	7	17
„ 750 „ 780	1	9	8	18
„ 780 „ 840	1	10	8	19
„ 840 „ 870	1	10	9	20
„ 870 „ 930	1	11	9	21
„ 930 „ 960	1	11	10	22
„ 960 „ 1,020	1	12	10	23
„ 1,020 „ 1,050	1	12	11	24

APPENDIX E.

Expenses of Education Boards.

Average for Three Years—1898, 1899, 1900.

District.	Office Staff, &c.	Incidental Expenses of Schools.	Contingencies.	Total.
	£	£	£	£
Auckland	4,384	7,260	1,158	12,802
Taranaki	685	1,092	513	2,290
Wanganui	1,492	1,686	730	3,908
Wellington	2,713	3,712	379	6,804
Hawke's Bay	1,351	2,354	323	4,028
Marlborough	469	491	169	1,129
Nelson	1,130	92	2,314	3,536
Grey	376	121	274	771
Westland	437	139	133	709
North Canterbury	2,534	6,816	647	9,997
South Canterbury	1,008	1,261	395	2,664
Otago	3,685	5,230	419	9,334
Southland	1,434	2,071	676	4,181
Totals	£21,698	£32,325	£8,130	£62,153

APPENDIX F.

SUMMARY showing average Annual Expenditure of Education Boards during Three Years—1898, 1899, 1900—for Office and General Expenses, excluding Scholarships, Training of Teachers, Buildings, &c.; also Allowances to Boards under Scales 1 and 2.

Education Boards.	Average Expenditure—1898, 1899, 1900.	Scale 1. Allowances—viz., £250 + Capitation @ 11/3.	Scale 2. Allowances—viz., Capitation @ 12/-, with £250 to each Board having less than 8,000 in average attendance.
	£	£	£
Auckland	12,802	13,732	14,381
Taranaki	2,290	2,120	2,244
Wanganui	3,909	5,242	5,324
Wellington... ...	6,804	7,195	7,408
Hawke's Bay ...	4,028	4,098	4,355
Marlborough ...	1,129	1,253	1,320
Nelson	3,536	2,884	3,059
Grey	772	1,068	1,123
Westland	709	891	934
North Canterbury ...	9,997	9,672	10,050
South Canterbury ...	2,663	2,787	2,957
Otago	9,334	10,258	10,677
Southland	4,180	4,766	4,817
Totals ...	£62,153	£65,966	£68,649

APPENDIX G.

The following table gives an approximate estimate of the total amounts of teachers' salaries under Scales 1 and 2, based on the number of schools and the average attendance for December, 1900; together with the total salaries in the most numerous class of schools—*i.e.*, in the 1,039 schools, having an average attendance of 40 or less :—

Line Scale 1-2.	Class of School.	Number of Schools.	Total Average Attendance.	Cost of Assistants in each School.	Total Number of Assistants, Scales 1 or 2.	Total Cost of Assistants, Scale 1.	Total Cost of Assistants, Scale 2.	Head-teachers' Salaries, Scale 1.	Total Cost of Salaries of Head-masters, Scale 2.	Pupil-teachers: Number required.	Total Salaries of Pupil-teachers
				£		£	£	£	£		£
1	Below 21	490	6,314	...	...	...	...	31,570	31,570	...	...
2	21–30	321	16,104	...	...	...	...	38,114	39,719	...	...
3	31–40	228		...	...	...	...	32,511	33,651	...	...
4	41–50	140	6,288	80	140	11,200	11,900	22,400	23,100	...	...
5	51–70	145	8,519	85	145	12,325	13,050	25,511	26,236	...	...
6	71–90	87	6,918	95	87	8,265	8,700	17,565	18,000	...	...
7	91–120	69	7,293	100	69	6,900	7,245	15,160	15,505	69	2,415
8	121–150	35	4,737	105	35	3,675	3,850	8,001	8,176	70	2,450
9	151–200	37	6,339	190	74	7,030	7,400	8,858	9,043	74	2,590
10	201–250	31	6,751	350	93	10,850	11,315	7,854	8,009	62	2,170
11	251–280	10	5,373	375	30	3,750	3,900	2,668	2,713	27	945
12	281–330	9		490	36	4,410	4,590	2,493	2,543	30	1,050
13	331–390	15	5,402	610	75	9,150	9,525	4,320	4,395	45	1,575
14	391–420	6	2,471	630	30	3,780	3,930	1,782	1,812	24	840
15	421–480	13	5,817	765	78	9,945	10,335	3,978	4,043	52	1,820
16	481–510	6	2,977	800	36	4,800	4,980	1,890	1,920	30	1,050
17	511–570	12	6,362	910	72	10,920	11,280	3,888	3,948	60	2,100
18	571–600	2	1,168	920	14	1,840	1,910	666	676	12	420
19	601–660	10	6,282	1,025	80	10,250	10,650	3,420	3,470	60	2,100
20	661–690	2	1,354	1,085	16	2,170	2,250	699	709	14	490
21	691–750	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
22	751–780	2	1,514	1,270	18	2,540	2,630	717	727	16	560
23	781–840	2	1,593	1,370	20	2,740	2,840	726	736	16	560
24	841–870	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
25	871–930	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
26	931–960	1	941	1,480	11	1,480	1,535	375	380	10	350
27	961–1020	1	981	1,565	12	1,565	1,625	375	380	10	350
		1,674	111,498	...	1,171	129,585	135,440	235,541	241,461	681	23,835

SCHOOLS HAVING AN AVERAGE ATTENDANCE NOT OVER 40.

Grade of School.	Total Amount of Salaries as at present paid by Board.	Total Amount of Salaries payable under No. 1 Scale.	Increase in Total Amount of Salaries.
	£	£	£
1 to 20	28,844	31,570	2,726
21 to 30	33,340	38,114	4,774
31 to 40	29,672	32,716	3,044
Totals	91,856	102,400	10,544

Inasmuch as the number of schools is greater at the end of the year than at any other time, and the average attendance for the December quarter is less than the average attendance for the whole year, and for other reasons, it is necessary to make some adjustment in the above totals in order to arrive at a true estimate of the amount required for all salaries payable under Scale 1 or Scale 2. Among the other reasons referred to may be named: (1) The deduction of 10 per cent. proposed to be made from the salaries of uncertificated teachers; (2) the employment of female teachers, in accordance with the present practice of several Boards, in many positions where the proposed scales would allow male teachers to be employed; (3) a further shortage of male teachers, the supply being insufficient, even with the qualification named in the last clause, to fill all the places available for men under the proposed scales.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.

WELLINGTON.

MONDAY, 22ND APRIL, 1901.

THE Commission met at 2 p.m. in the office of the Education Board.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

The secretary (Mr. A. J. Morton, B.A.) and the reporter (Mr. G. F. McGirr) were also in attendance.

The secretary read the commission.

It was resolved, That the proceedings be open to the Press.

It was decided that each education district of the colony should be visited by the Commission.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., Secretary for Education and Inspector-General of Schools, attended, and stated that he had been directed by the Minister of Education to provide any information required, and, if the Commission agreed, to attend the meetings and examine witnesses.

The Chairman said that Mr. Hogben's presence and assistance would be very welcome to all the Commissioners.

Evidence was given by Mr. Hogben, who laid before the Commission a scheme of staffs and salaries (Exhibit No. 2) prepared by him.

It was resolved, That the Hon. the Minister of Education be requested to have this scheme distributed among teachers and the members of Boards and School Committees.

The Commission adjourned at 3.20 p.m. until 10 a.m. next day.

TUESDAY, 23RD APRIL, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

It was decided to proceed to Blenheim on the 25th April, and then to visit the remaining centres of education districts of the South Island.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., continued his evidence, and laid before the Commission Exhibits Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. At the close of his evidence-in-chief the Commissioners expressed their appreciation of the valuable information furnished by Mr. Hogben.

It was decided that the date of meeting be notified by advertisement in each centre visited.

A discussion, introduced by Mr. Mackenzie, took place as to the scope of the Commissioners' investigation, with special reference to the high schools. It was decided to consider only questions referred to in the Commission.

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. until 10 a.m. next day.

WEDNESDAY, 24TH APRIL, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was examined by Commissioners, and put in Exhibit No. 9.

The Commission adjourned at 12 noon till 10 a.m. the next day.

THURSDAY, 25TH APRIL, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Mr. Weston was granted leave of absence from the 27th April until the Commission met in Christchurch. He stated that his absence was occasioned by important public and private business.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was further examined, and placed before the Commission Exhibit No. 10.

The Commission adjourned at 11.30 a.m. until 10 a.m. on the 27th April, at Blenheim.

BLENHEIM.

SATURDAY, 27TH APRIL, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. in the office of the Marlborough Education Board.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., Secretary for Education, also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The Chairman presented a suggested list of dates of visits to the districts of the South Island, which was adopted.

Evidence was given by Captain Baillie, M.L.C. (Acting-Chairman of the Marlborough Education Board); Mr. R. McCallum (member of the Marlborough Education Board), who handed in Exhibits Nos. 11, 12, and 13; Mr. F. Birch (Chairman, Blenheim School Committee), Mr. N. T. Pritchard (Chairman, Grovetown School Committee), Miss M. C. Williams, Mr. C. C. Howard, Mr. D. A. Sturrock, and Mr. G. Wilmot (representatives of the Marlborough Educational Institute).

A vote of thanks was passed to the Board, its officers, and the witnesses.

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. until 10 a.m. on the 30th April, at Nelson.

NELSON.

TUESDAY, 30TH APRIL, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. at the office of the Education Board.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

A statement was received from Mr. E. Cowles, headmaster of the Richmond Boys' School; and a letter was received from the Assistant Secretary of the Education Department intimating that Mr. R. G. Thomson had been appointed second shorthand-writer to the Commission.

Evidence was given by Messrs. G. Talbot (Chairman, Nelson Education Board), T. Bailie and H. Philips (members of the Nelson Education Board), Stead Ellis (secretary, Nelson Education Board), Rev. J. P. Kempthorne (Chairman, Nelson School Committee), Rev. J. H. McKenzie (member, Nelson School Committee), F. G. Gibbs, M.A., and L. D. Easton (representatives of the Nelson Educational Institute), G. A. Harkness, M.A. (Chief Inspector, Nelson Education District), and W. F. Worley and F. V. Knapp (assistant masters, Nelson Boys' School).

Exhibits were handed in—No. 14 by Mr. Hogben, No. 15 by the secretary, and No. 16 by Mr. Gibbs.

A vote of thanks was passed to the Board, its officers, and the witnesses.

The Commission adjourned at 10.20 p.m. until 10 a.m. on the 4th May, at Greymouth.

GREYMOUTH.

SATURDAY, 4TH MAY, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. at the office of the Grey County Council.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Evidence was given by Messrs. S. R. Harris (Chairman, Grey Education Board), W. R. Kettle, and J. Petrie (members, Grey Education Board), F. W. Riemenschneider (secretary, Grey Education Board), and the following teachers: W. A. Rundle and H. Smith, B.A. (representatives of the Grey Educational Institute), and A. A. Adams.

The secretary laid before the Commission Exhibits Nos. 17 and 18, and Mr. Kettle Exhibit No. 19 (list of teachers, with salaries, for the Grey District).

A vote of thanks was passed to the Board, its officers, and the witnesses; also to the Grey County Council for the use of the room.

The Commission adjourned at 3 p.m. until 10 a.m. on the 6th May, at Hokitika.

HOKITIKA.

MONDAY, 6TH MAY, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. at the Town Hall, Hokitika.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

It was decided that a return be obtained from each Education Board of the salaries of teachers for the December quarter, house allowance, &c.

Evidence was given by Messrs. J. McWhirter (Chairman, Westland Education Board), J. Grimmond and H. L. Michel (members, Westland Education Board), A. J. Morton, B.A. (Inspector of Schools, and secretary to the Westland Education Board), and the following teachers: Miss W. J. Aitken, Messrs. H. G. Wake, B.A., J. J. Henderson, and W. D. Mackay (representatives of the Westland Educational Institute). The evidence of Mr. A. A. Adams, who was examined in Greymouth, was continued.

Statements were handed in by the secretary (Exhibits Nos. 20, 21, 22, and 23), Mr. Hogben (Exhibit No. 24), and Mr. Henderson, on behalf of the Westland Educational Institute (Exhibit No. 25).

A vote of thanks was passed to the Board, its officers, and the witnesses; also to the Hokitika Borough Council for the use of the Town Hall.

The Commission adjourned at 5.30 p.m. until 10 a.m. on the 10th May, at Christchurch.

CHRISTCHURCH.

FRIDAY, 10TH MAY, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. in the office of the Education Board.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The secretary laid before the Commission the regulations of the Education Boards (Exhibits Nos. 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42); and it was resolved, That an application be made to the Hon. the Minister of Education for an extension of time of forty days.

Evidence was given by Mr. H. C. Lane (secretary of the North Canterbury Education Board), who presented a comparative statement of expenditure for 1900 (Exhibits Nos. 29 and 30).

Evidence was also given by Mr. L. B. Wood, M.A. (representing the Inspectors of the North Canterbury District).

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. until 10 a.m. the next day.

SATURDAY, 11TH MAY, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Mr. Mackenzie referred to the incompleteness of the reports of the Commission's proceedings distributed by the Press Association. The Chairman remarked that, while local reports were usually very satisfactory, those provided by the Press Association were very scanty.

An application was received from Mr. N. Friberg, secretary of the Palmerston North Branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute, for an opportunity to appear before the Commission at Palmerston North. It was decided to hear the representatives at Wanganui.

Statements were handed in by the secretary (Exhibits Nos. 43 and 45), Mr. Hogben (Exhibit No. 44), and Mr. J. R. Brunt, Chairman of the East Christchurch School Committee (Exhibit No. 46).

Evidence was given by His Honour Mr. Justice Cooper (recently a member of the Auckland Education Board), Mr. R. J. Paull (Chairman of the Richmond School Committee), and the following teachers, representing sections of the North Canterbury Educational Institue: Messrs. W. J. Boyce, C. D. Hardie, R. B. Ryder, and L. Watson.

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. until 10 a.m. on the 13th May.

MONDAY, 13TH MAY, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Evidence was given by Messrs. J. R. Brunt (Chairman, East Christchurch School Committee), — Morris (Chairman, West Christchurch School Committee), G. F. Henry (secretary, East Christchurch School Committee), and the following teachers: T. Hughes, M.A. (honorary secretary, North Canterbury Educational Institute), T. Watkins, B.A., T. S. Foster, M.A., and F. Rowley; Misses Glanville, Kitchingman, and Menzies; Mesdames Wilkinson and Lissaman; and Mr. H. C. Lane added a short statement to his previous evidence.

Statements were handed in by the secretary (Exhibit No. 48) and Mr. Hughes (Exhibit No. 47).

A vote of thanks was passed to the Board, its officers, and the witnesses.

The Commission adjourned at 5.30 p.m. until 10 a.m. on the 16th May, at Dunedin.

DUNEDIN.

THURSDAY, 16TH MAY, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. in the office of the Education Board.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

A letter was received from the secretary of the Marlborough Educational Institute recommending an allowance to retiring teachers.

Mr. Weston laid before the Commission a statement, by Mr. L. B. Wood, M.A., of suggested amendments to the scale submitted by Mr. Hogben (Exhibit No. 49).

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., Secretary for Education, placed before the Commission, and explained, a suggested alternative scheme of staffs and salaries in connection with schools of from 15 to 330 in average attendance (Exhibit No. 50).

Evidence was given by Rev. P. B. Fraser, M.A. (who handed in Exhibit No. 51), and Mr. J. Mitchell (members of the Otago Education Board), and Mr. P. G. Pryde (secretary to the Otago Education Board).

Mr. Pryde laid before the Commission a statement of allowances to Committees, &c. (Exhibit No. 52).

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. till 10 a.m. next day.

FRIDAY, 17TH MAY, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Mr. Hogben stated that the increase involved in raising the salaries of assistant teachers, according to his suggested alternative scale, to the rate of payment obtaining in Otago would practically be not more than the proposed grant would cover.

Further evidence was given by Mr. P. G. Pryde, and Mr. P. Goyen (Inspector of Schools, Otago District) also gave evidence.

Mr. Pryde laid before the Commission a statement of the amounts raised locally by School Committees (Exhibit No. 53).

A meeting was held in committee at 5 p.m. to consider the dates of visits to the remaining Board centres. It was decided to meet in Invercargill on the 22nd May, and a committee was appointed to prepare suggestions regarding later dates.

The Commission adjourned at 4·45 p.m. until 10 a.m. next day.

SATURDAY, 18TH MAY, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m., in the Agricultural Hall, Dunedin.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The secretary of the Otago Education Board presented an estimate of receipts and expenditure for the Otago District under the suggested scale (Exhibit No. 54).

A report was received, prepared by a committee of the Otago Branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute, on the scales submitted by the Inspector-General of Schools (Exhibit No. 55).

Evidence was given by Miss Hooper, Messrs. D. R. White, M.A., W. E. Bastings, and W. G. Macdonald (representatives of the Otago Educational Institute).

The Commission met in committee, and adopted a list of dates of visits to the remaining Board centres.

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. till 10 a.m. on the 20th May.

MONDAY, 20TH MAY, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. in the office of the Education Board.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

An application was received from Mr. A. Stevenson, on behalf of the teachers of the district, for an opportunity to appear before the Commission in Woodville.

It was decided that the request could not be granted.

Statements were received from Mr. James Smith, Mr. S. C. Owen, Mr. W. Winchester, and Mr. A. C. Maxwell.

Evidence was given by Mr. H. Harroway (Chairman, Otago Education Board), Mr. W. S. Fitzgerald (Inspector of Schools, Otago District), Miss E. Wilkinson, Messrs. C. Young, A. Marshall, and A. Davidson (representatives of the Otago Educational Institute), and Messrs. C. G. Smeaton and J. Reid, B.A. (representing the assistant masters).

Mr. P. Goyen (recalled) explained a comparative table of staffs, which he placed before the Commission (Exhibit No. 60).

Mr. D. R. White (recalled) placed before the Commission a statement of certificates held by teachers in the colony (Exhibit No. 61).

Exhibits were also laid before the Commission by Messrs. Smeaton (No. 56), Reid (No. 57), Harroway (No. 58), and Pryde (No. 59).

A vote of thanks was passed to the Board, its officers, and the witnesses.

The president of the Educational Institute (Mr. W. G. Macdonald) expressed the thanks of the Institute for the patient hearing granted to teachers when giving evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 6 p.m. till 10 a.m. on the 22nd May, at Invercargill.

INVERCARGILL.

WEDNESDAY, 22ND MAY, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. in the office of the Education Board.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Statements were received from Messrs. T. H. Newlyn, Christchurch, and W. Macandrew, Mataura.

Evidence was given by Messrs. J. Cowie (Chairman, Southland Education Board), G. R. George (member of the Southland Education Board), J. Neill (secretary, Southland Education Board), and Mr. W. H. Clark, B.A. (honorary secretary, Southland Educational Institute).

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. till 10 a.m. next day.

THURSDAY, 23RD MAY, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Evidence was given by Messrs. W. McAllister (member of the Southland Education Board), J. Hendry, B.A. (Inspector of Schools, Southland District), and the following teachers: Mr. W. G. Mehaffey, Miss J. B. Hamilton, and Mr. A. Clark (representing the Southland Educational Institute), Messrs. C. W. G. Selby and J. Porteous, M.A. (representing the assistants).

A statement was received from Mr. D. McNeil.

A vote of thanks was passed to the Board, its officers, and the witnesses.

The Commission adjourned at 5.30 p.m. till 10 a.m. on the 27th May, at Timaru.

TIMARU.

MONDAY, 27TH MAY, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. in the office of the Borough Council.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

A letter was received from the secretary of the Grey Educational Institute forwarding a copy of a resolution passed in favour of the suggested alternative scale submitted by Mr. Hogben.

The secretary handed in Exhibit No. 63.

Evidence was given by Mr. W. B. Howell (Chairman, South Canterbury Education Board), Rev. G. Barclay (member, South Canterbury Education Board), Messrs. J. G. Gow, M.A. (Inspector of Schools, South Canterbury District), A. Bell, M.A. (assistant secretary and Assistant Inspector), and J. A. Johnson, M.A. (president of the South Canterbury Educational Institute).

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. till 10 a.m. next day.

TUESDAY, 28TH MAY, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

It was decided,—(1) That the secretary be instructed to obtain from each Education Board a return of the number of appointments of teachers made during the past two years, and the number of teachers who were drawn from other districts during the same period; (2) that each Education Board be asked to furnish an estimate of the amount paid annually on account of the absence of teachers through sickness, and the supply of teachers on special service; (3) that the Secretary for Education be asked to prepare a return showing the salaries of teachers under the various Education Boards for the December quarter (*a*) by the Boards' scales, (*b*) by the proposed amended alternative scale; (4) that the Inspector-General be asked to prepare at his earliest convenience a complete scale showing the staffing of schools and salaries paid to teachers according to his alternative scheme.

Evidence was given by Messrs J. A. Valentine, B.A., J. P. Kalaugher, and M. McLeod (representing the South Canterbury Educational Institute), and the Rev. G. Barclay (recalled) also gave evidence.

A vote of thanks was passed to the Board, its officers, and the witnesses.

The Commission adjourned at 1 p.m. till 10 a.m. on the 1st June, at Auckland.

AUCKLAND.

SATURDAY, 1ST JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. in the office of the Education Board.

Present: Mr. S. Luke (in the chair); Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Leave of absence was granted to Mr. Hill on the 1st June, and to Mr. Smith on the 1st and 3rd June.

Statements were received from Messrs. A. M. Rust, A. Bramley, A. W. Tindall, H. von Blaramberg, and J. H. Burnard.

The secretary placed before the Commission Exhibits Nos. 64 and 65.

Evidence was given by Messrs. T. U. Wells (president of the Auckland Educational Institute), F. Brown (representing the second assistant masters), J. D. McNaughton (representing teachers of the Pukekohe district), J. Armstrong (representing headmasters, Auckland), A. Taylor (representing medium-sized schools), and Miss Shrewsbury, M.A. (representing assistant mistresses).

At 2.30 p.m. Mr. Hogg attended, and occupied the chair.

Mr. G. Hogben was also present from the same time.

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. until 10 a.m. next day.

MONDAY, 3RD JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Statements were received from Messrs. J. Moir, F. Jameson, and G. W. Murray.

Evidence was given by Messrs. W. R. C. Walker (representing the first assistant masters), H. Campbell (barrister), W. N. McIntosh (headmaster, Onehunga School), G. Squirrell (Chairman of the Auckland City School Committee), Miss Newman (representing infant mistresses), and G. Large (teacher, Waiuku School).

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. until 10 a.m. next day.

TUESDAY, 4TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., also attended.

The minutes of the previous day were read and confirmed.

It was decided that Commissioners be allowed an opportunity to correct questions in typewritten copies of evidence, and that the Government Printer be urged to proceed with the printing as rapidly as possible.

It was resolved, That an application be made to His Excellency the Governor for a further extension of time of forty days.

Statements were received from Messrs. H. H. D. Wily, N. H. S. Law, and J. C. Mill.

Evidence was given by Messrs. Vincent E. Rice (secretary, Auckland Education Board), L. J. Bagnall (Chairman, Auckland Education Board), R. Hobbs (ex-Chairman, Auckland Education Board), D. Petrie, M.A. (Chief Inspector of Schools, Auckland District), and O. Mays (Chairman of the Devonport School Committee).

A vote of thanks was passed to the Board, its officers, and witnesses.

The Commission adjourned at 5.45 p.m. until 10 a.m. on the 6th June, at New Plymouth.

NEW PLYMOUTH.

THURSDAY, 6TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. in the Borough Council Chambers.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Statements were received from Miss Kate Baldwin and eleven other assistant mistresses of North Canterbury; Messrs. H. B. Lusk, B.A. (representing graduates and undergraduates of Auckland), E. J. Darby (representing second and third assistant masters), A. Mathews, W. Bannerman, J. L. Scott, D. O'Donoghue, B.A., and B. Cronin.

The secretary placed before the Commission Exhibits Nos. 66 to 70.

It was decided that a return be obtained from each Board of the schools with an average attendance of 500 and upwards, showing the head-teachers and assistants, with the classes taught by them.

Evidence was given by Messrs. D. McAllum (Chairman, Taranaki Education Board), G. W. Potts (representing the Taranaki Educational Institute), and W. E. Spencer, M.A., B.Sc. (Inspector of Schools, Taranaki District).

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. until 10 a.m. next day.

FRIDAY, 7TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

The minutes of the previous day were read and confirmed.

Statements were received from Messrs. T. W. Leys, F. P. Burton, B.A., and K. Williamson.

Evidence was given by Messrs. P. S. Whitcombe (secretary, Taranaki Education Board), H. Allsworth (member of the Taranaki Education Board), and H. Dempsey (representing the Taranaki Educational Institute).

A vote of thanks was passed to the Board, its officers, and witnesses; also to the Borough Council for the use of room for meetings.

The Chairman expressed, on behalf of the Commissioners, appreciation of the attention paid by the Press to the proceedings of the Commission.

The Commission adjourned at 1 p.m. until 10 a.m. on Monday, the 10th June, at Wanganui.

WANGANUI.

MONDAY, 10TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. in the office of the Education Board.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Mr. C. Brown, secretary of the College Street School Committee, Palmerston North, forwarded a resolution in favour of maintaining the present status of assistants.

The secretary placed before the Commission Exhibits Nos. 71 to 73.

Evidence was given by Messrs. G. S. Bridge (Chairman, Wanganui Education Board) and Dr. J. Smyth (Chief Inspector of Schools, Wanganui District).

The Chairman interrupted the evidence to announce the sudden death of the wife of the Chairman of the Board (who had given evidence in the morning). A letter of condolence from the Commission was forwarded to Mr. Bridge.

Mr. Weston moved, and Mr. Luke seconded, That, as a mark of respect and condolence, the Commission adjourn until next morning at 9 a.m. The motion was carried unanimously, all the members recording their votes standing.

The Commission adjourned at 3.45 p.m. until 9 a.m. next day.

TUESDAY, 11TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

The minutes of the previous day were read and confirmed.

A statement was received from Mr. D. L. Smart.

The secretary placed before the Commission Exhibit No. 74.

The evidence of Dr. Smyth was continued.

Evidence was also given by Messrs. A. A. Browne (secretary, Wanganui Education Board), J. Aitken, B.A. (representing the Wanganui Educational Institute), J. K. Law (representing the Wanganui Educational Institute), G. Grant (representing the teachers of the Palmerston North district), and H. Espiner (representing the country schools of the Palmerston North district).

A vote of thanks was passed to the Board, its officers, and witnesses.

The Commission adjourned at 5.15 p.m. until 10 a.m. on Thursday, the 13th June, at Napier.

NAPIER.

THURSDAY, 13TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 11 a.m. in the office of the Education Board.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Statements were received from Messrs. H. J. Howard (honorary secretary, Marlborough Educational Institute), C. M. McKenzie, and A. A. Adams.

The secretary placed before the Commission Exhibits Nos. 75 to 80.

It was decided to obtain from Education Boards a return of all sums of money transferred from the General Account to the Building Fund during the past six years.

Evidence was given by Messrs. the Rev. Dr. Sidey (Chairman, Hawke's Bay Education Board), G. T. Fannin (secretary, Hawke's Bay Education Board), T. Tanner (member of the Hawke's Bay Education Board), and Miss J. C. Brown (headmistress, Napier Main School) and Miss Ferguson (assistant mistress, Taradale School).

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. until 10 a.m. next day.

FRIDAY, 14TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

The minutes of the previous day were read and confirmed.

A statement was received from Mr. W. Rapson.

The secretary placed before the Commission Exhibits Nos. 81 and 82.

Evidence was given by Messrs. J. C. Westall (member of the Hawke's Bay Education Board), J. D. Watson, M.A. (president of the Hawke's Bay Educational Institute), J. A. Smith, B.A. (representing the Hawke's Bay Educational Institute), J. Caughley (headmaster of the Kaikora North School), R. B. Holmes (headmaster of the Havelock North School), and Miss Burden (head-teacher of the Kumeroa School).

A vote of thanks was passed to the Board, its officers, and the witnesses.

The Commission adjourned at 8.30 p.m. until 10 a.m. on Monday, the 17th June, at Wellington.

WELLINGTON.

MONDAY, 17TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m. at the office of the Education Board.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

A statement was received from the Chairman of the Woodville School Committee.

The secretary placed before the Commission Exhibits Nos. 83 to 91.

Evidence was given by Messrs. C. Watson, B.A. (representing the Wellington Educational Institute), A. Erskine (representing the assistant masters), J. C. Webb, B.A. (representing the assistant masters), and Miss Lorimer, M.A. (representing the Wellington Educational Institute).

Mr. Watson laid before the Commission an abstract statement from the London School Board Report for 1898 (Exhibit No. 92).

The Commission adjourned at 5.10 p.m. until 10 a.m. on Saturday, the 22nd June.

SATURDAY, 22ND JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Statements were received from Messrs. E. K. Mulgan, M.A. (Inspector of Schools), F. T. Evans, and T. Holden.

The secretary placed before the Commission Exhibits Nos. 93 to 96.

Evidence was given by Mr. F. Bennett (representing the Wellington Educational Institute), Mrs. C. A. Francis (headmistress of the Mount Cook Infants' School), and Miss Myers (assistant mistress, Roseneath School).

The Commission adjourned at 4.10 p.m. until 10 a.m. on Monday, the 24th June.

MONDAY, 24TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

A letter was received from the secretary of the Education Board, Marlborough, forwarding resolution passed by the Marlborough Educational Institute regarding retiring-allowances for teachers, and recommending the same to the favourable consideration of the Commission.

Evidence was given by Miss Craig (representing the Wellington Educational Institute), Mr. W. T. Grundy (headmaster of the Clyde Quay School, Wellington), and Mr. T. H. Gill, M.A., LL.B. (secretary, New Zealand Educational Institute, and headmaster of the Newtown School).

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. until 10 a.m. next day.

TUESDAY, 25TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

The minutes of the previous day were read and confirmed.

A statement was received from Mr. Neve, M.A. (forwarding recommendations from the teachers of the Buller district), and also from Mr. A. W. Shrimpton, M.A.

The secretary placed before the Commission Exhibits Nos. 97 to 99.

Mr. H. Hill, B.A. (Commissioner), placed before the Commission a scheme of staffs and salaries, with classification of teachers (Exhibit No. 100).

It was decided that the scheme be printed and distributed among the Commissioners.

Evidence was given by Messrs. J. Robertson (member of the Wellington Education Board) and C. R. Joplin (headmaster, Wadestown School).

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. until 10 a.m. next day.

WEDNESDAY, 26TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

Evidence was given by Mr. J. J. Pilkington (headmaster of the Porirua School).

The Commission adjourned at 1 p.m. until 10 a.m. next day.

THURSDAY, 27TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

The minutes of the previous day were read and confirmed.

A statement was received from Miss C. Henderson and other officers and members of the North Canterbury Women Teachers' Association.

The secretary placed before the Commission Exhibits No. 101, 102, and 103.

The evidence of Mr. J. J. Pilkington was continued.

Evidence was also given by Mr. A. Dorset (secretary of the Wellington Education Board) and Mr. J. R. Blair (Chairman of the Wellington Education Board).

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. until 10 a.m. next day.

FRIDAY, 28TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

The minutes of the previous day were read and confirmed.

The evidence of Mr. Dorset was continued.

Evidence was also given by Messrs. R. Lee (Chief Inspector of Schools, Wellington District), T. R. Fleming, M.A., LL.B. (Inspector of Schools, Wellington District), and H. B. Kirk, M.A. (Inspector of Native Schools).

Mr. Kirk handed in three tables relating to certificates (Exhibit No. 106).

The secretary placed before the Commission Exhibits Nos. 104 and 105.

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. until 10 a.m. next day.

SATURDAY, 29TH JUNE, 1901.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was also present.

The minutes of the previous day were read and confirmed.

Mr. G. Hogben (Secretary for Education) placed before the Commission a full statement of his amended scheme of staffs and salaries on the basis of a £4 capitation (Exhibit No. 107).

It was decided that a committee be formed to prepare a draft report, such committee consisting of the Chairman (Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R.) and Messrs. Gilfedder, Davidson, Hill, Weston, and Stewart.

The evidence of Mr. G. Hogben, M.A., was continued, and he placed before the Commission a scheme of staffs and salaries on the basis of a £4 5s. capitation (Exhibit No. 110).

It was decided to ask the Education Department to furnish a statement of the number of schools in the colony in the several grades and classes of the scheme presented by Mr. Hill.

Mr. Weston placed before the Commission Exhibit No. 108.

The secretary placed before the Commission Exhibit No. 109.

A statement was received from Mr. W. F. Ford.

At 2.30 p.m., in the absence of the Chairman, Mr. S. Luke presided.

A vote of thanks was passed to the Board, its officers, and witnesses; also to Mr. Luke for his services as temporary Chairman.

The Commission adjourned *sine die*.

TUESDAY, 16TH JULY, 1901.

The Commission met at 11 a.m. at the Parliamentary Buildings, Wellington.

Present: Mr. S. Luke (in the chair); Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. W. Davidson, Mr. R. D. Stewart, and Mr. J. Smith.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Commission, and of the last meeting of the committee, were read and confirmed.

The secretary placed before the Commission scales Nos. 1 and 2, recommended by the committee; these were received, and consideration of them was deferred.

It was decided to apply to His Excellency the Governor for a further extension of time of fourteen days, and that a committee, consisting of the Chairman and Messrs. Weston, Mackenzie, and Hill, explain to the Hon. the Minister of Education the reasons for the application.

A committee, consisting of the Chairman and Messrs. Weston, Davidson, and Stewart, was appointed to select matter from the exhibits and statements for printing.

The Commission adjourned *sine die*.

FRIDAY, 26TH JULY, 1901.

The Commission met at 2 p.m.

Present: Mr. T. S. Weston (in the chair); Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. F. Y. Lethbridge, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Commission were read and confirmed.

Mr. Weston, as acting-chairman of the sub-committees appointed to deal therewith, laid before the Commission,—(1) A recommendation as to the printing of certain exhibits; (2) a recommendation that no statements, other than those of witnesses, be published; (3) a copy of the draft report, with Appendices A to F (including scales Nos. 1 and 2, and tables). These were received by the Commission.

Mr. Hogg entered, and occupied the chair.

It was resolved,—

(1.) That the Hon. the Minister of Education be asked to grant a bonus to the secretary of the Commission.

(2.) That an appreciation of the excellent services of the official reporters, Messrs. G. F. McGirr and R. G. Thomson, be recorded, and that a copy of the resolution be sent to each.

(3.) That a hearty vote of thanks be recorded to Mr. G. Hogben, M.A. (Secretary for Education and Inspector of Schools), also to the members of the staff, for valuable assistance rendered to the Commission, and that letters be written to the Minister of Education and Mr. Hogben acknowledging the indebtedness of the Commission to the Education Department.

(4.) That a hearty vote of thanks be recorded for the able manner in which the Chairman of the Commission had presided over the deliberations of the Commission.

The Chairman thanked the members for the last resolution, and expressed the pleasure afforded him by his connection with the Commission.

During the sitting the Commission considered the draft report, and Mr. Weston and the secretary were instructed to have the report printed, with certain amendments.

The Commission adjourned at 10.30 p.m. until 2 p.m. on Monday, the 29th July.

MONDAY, 29TH JULY, 1901.

The Commission met at 2 p.m.

Present: Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R. (in the chair), Mr. T. Mackenzie, M.H.R., Mr. M. Gilfedder, M.H.R.; Mr. T. S. Weston, Mr. S. Luke, Mr. H. Hill, B.A., Mr. J. Smith, Mr. W. Davidson, and Mr. R. D. Stewart.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Commission were read and confirmed.

It was resolved,—

(1.) That a full copy of the report and minutes of evidence be sent to the head-teacher of each school, the Chairman of each School Committee, and to all members of Education Boards.

(2.) That a copy of the report, with appendices attached thereto, be sent to each teacher in the colony.

The Commission adopted the final revise of the report, with Appendices A to G.

Mr. Gilfedder drew attention to a report that action was being taken by the Wellington Education Board against the Chief Inspector of Schools on account of certain evidence given before the Commission.

The Chairman explained that the statement referred to was only a repetition of one made by that officer previously, and that the action referred to was not really based on any part of his evidence.

The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m. *sine die*.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

WELLINGTON.

MONDAY, 22ND APRIL, 1901.

Mr. G. HOGBEN, M.A., Secretary for Education and Inspector-General of Schools, examined.

Mr. Hogben: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen,—I have to put before you one or two matters. I wish to state that I appear before the Commission on behalf of the Education Department, and that I desire to afford the Commission every assistance—which, of course, the Commission has a right to demand—that lies in my power; and this not only in regard to giving all the information which the Commission asks for, and which may be useful to it, but to assist the Commission by asking questions of the witnesses who may appear before it, so that not only the present work of the Commission, but the carrying-out of any new policy based on the report of the Commission may be all the easier. The principal evidence I shall bring before the Commission will be on the lines of a memorandum prepared for the Minister of Education some months ago, which takes the form of a suggested colonial scale of staff and salaries. There are a great many matters discussed in it which will take some time to explain; but briefly this scale of staff and salaries is a proposed manner of distributing the main portion of the vote for primary education—namely, the capitation on average attendance. I will hand in a copy of this colonial scale of staff and salaries to the Commission [Exhibit 2]. Four pounds has been assumed as the capitation grant. Under the present statutory grant of £3 15s.—that is, without the 5s. increase—this suggested scale would be utterly impossible. The total amount of the capitation grant for the year ending 31st December, 1899, at £4 per head of the average attendance would be £441,263. Out of the capitation grant there are payable all teachers' allowances and salaries, and also the general expenses of the Education Boards and School Committees. At the present time the capitation grant is payable to each Board on the average attendance of all the schools in its district. One of the first points it is necessary to consider is that the introduction of this colonial scale of staff and salaries necessarily involves the question of the finance of the Boards, inasmuch as the capitation basis of payment to Boards is unworkable in conjunction with this scale, and would render it impossible. For instance, in the smallest district—Westland—the total of salaries and allowances under the scale exceeds the total amount of the capitation grant, even at the increased rate of £4 per head; and in other small districts, and in large districts where the population is sparse and small schools are numerous, the balance available, after paying teachers' salaries and allowances according to the scale, for the general expenses of the Boards even if these are reduced to the utmost limit, is too small. My position is this: that you cannot deal with this £4 in such a way as to secure uniform salaries except by taking the amount available for the whole colony, and that you cannot get a uniform scale of salaries without a uniform scale of staff. I would call your attention to paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of the attached memorandum. In regard to the third proviso, "To remove inequalities and anomalies of salaries paid," I may say that the same positions in different districts are paid salaries that differ very widely indeed, but that is a point I can illustrate later on. Coming to the fourth proviso—"Consistently with the above," &c.— I want my position here to be perfectly clear that in projecting this scheme there has been no intention whatever of any policy that shall intrench upon the discretion of the Boards.

1. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] What do you call the discretion of the Boards?—Well, I will say the functions of the Boards. The intention of interfering with those functions has been attributed to me, but does not exist in my mind. I cannot avoid giving an expression of opinion upon it, holding, as I do, that you must have in certain matters strong and efficient local control; and I take this opportunity of saying so, because if there is anything in this scheme that interferes with the proper functions of the Boards it was not intended to be there. There is not in this scheme any proposal to interfere with the prerogative of Boards in the appointment and dismissal of teachers, or with their control of teachers under the Education Act. The only thing proposed is to establish a colonial scale. I say this without any reserve.

2. The Boards, and not the Government, shall have the payment of teachers?—Certainly, the Government laying down what staff there should be, and what the teachers are to be paid. Of course, I point out that this circular has not been adopted by the Government; it is simply proposed, and the responsibility of proposing it must rest with me.

3. *Mr. Stewart.*] I understand Mr. Hogben wishes us to accept this simply as a basis of discussion?—Yes, as the basis on which I found my evidence.

Mr. Davidson: I think it would be unwise to go very far into this question to-day. It would be better to study this proposed scale carefully to-night, and we should then be prepared to-morrow to question Mr. Hogben upon the details.

4. *Mr. Stewart.*] I would like to ask, does Mr. Hogben regard it as necessary that the money should be paid directly from the Department or the Boards? I suppose it does not affect the question whether the Boards pay the teachers in its own employ?—Theoretically, it does not make any difference at all whether the Department pays or the Boards pay. I think it better that the Boards should pay, although I do not say that the Department ought not to pay. It is a question whether the teachers should lose because their average attendance goes down one particular quarter—whether it should not be based on a longer period. Whatever a Board pays it can claim from the Department.

5. *The Chairman.*] You think that the Department should not interfere with the privileges of the Board as paymasters?—It should not. On page 4 of this circular there is an estimate of the distribution of payments on the scale of the £4 capitation grant, an estimate that was arrived at practically in detail, and on the following page—5—there is the proposed scale of staff and salaries. The estimate on page 4 shows that the amount payable for salaries for the December quarter, 1899, according to the proposed scale, would be £379,960, and the statement is drawn up in this way in order to show that the Boards would be certain of an income of £65,303. Under the present scales the balance available for the Boards' general expenses would have been for the December quarter, 1899, £59,973. According to the proposed scale, the balance to the Boards is £250 for each Board and a capitation of 11s. 3d., showing clearly that there is more available for the Boards under this scheme than there was before.

6. *Mr. Stewart.*] I understand that Mr. Hogben has taken the figures for the years ending 1899 and 1900, and has worked his scale against the total amount of capitation allowance for each of those annual periods, and has found that the Boards would still have a larger amount to meet their general expenditure than they had spent in the years he has mentioned; that the scheme which he has laid on the table is applicable to the whole colony, large and small centres, and that it does not curtail the amounts spent by the Boards, but leaves them a balance?—Yes. The Commission is aware of the difficulties the various Boards laboured under, not having sufficiently large allowances to meet their expenditure, and it is a question which has been brought before the Minister several times. The only direction in which the Minister saw his way to deal with the question was by giving a larger amount to the Boards in order to enable them to make better allowances, and hence one of the objects in drawing up this scheme was to give the Boards, as well as the teachers, larger allowances than before.

TUESDAY, 23RD APRIL, 1901.

Mr. G. HOGBEN'S examination continued.

Mr. Hogben: In addition to my proposed colonial scale of staff and salaries, I have a supplementary scale of proposals for salaries where the boys' schools are separate from the girls' or infants' schools, called "Salaries for assistants of separate schools" [Exhibit 3]. Another table shows the number of schools in each grade shown by the suggested scale [Exhibit 4]. On the top of page 4 of Exhibit 2 is a financial summary showing the distribution of the capitation vote and the inspection subsidy according to the proposed scale, based on the returns for the December quarter, 1899. I have a similar summary for the December quarter, 1900 [Exhibit 5]. In making my general statement, Mr. Chairman, I propose to go through the different headings of this memorandum, and to make a few remarks explaining what is already set down there. The opening part I have already referred to. With regard to staffing the schools, the first thing that I should impress upon the Commission is that it is impossible to have a uniform scale of salaries without a uniform scale of staff; one necessarily involves the other, both as to the numbers of the staff, and to the same extent, though not absolutely in a fixed manner, to the constitution of the staff. It would not be possible to have a uniform scale if, for instance, in some districts the first assistant after the head-teacher was a pupil-teacher, while in other districts the first assistant after the head-teacher was a certificated teacher; such a condition would destroy the possibility of having a uniform scale of staffs and salaries. It would interfere with the one I have suggested, and I do not see any way out of that particular difficulty. In large schools it might be possible to have slight variations of staff without interfering with a colonial scale. For instance, it might be possible sometimes to appoint two pupil-teachers in lieu of one assistant, the salary of the assistant—a junior assistant—being equal to those of the pupil-teachers. There are thirteen Boards and thirteen systems of staffing schools in the colony. Sometimes, especially in the case of neighbouring Boards, although the details may have diverged a little, there is the same essential principle at the base of the scales of two or three Boards. At present in eight districts the first increase of a staff takes the form of the addition of a pupil-teacher. I take objection to that—of course, I am expressing my own views, and indicating one or two reasons why I hold those views; the chief argument in favour of the addition of a pupil-teacher is its cheapness, and I do not know of any strong argument for it with that exception. It is true that the pupil-teacher system performs in this colony a very important function in supplying a place for the training of teachers, but that is not essential if you have a complete system of training-colleges: it would be essential to have a period of probation, but not a pupil-teachership. Pupil-teachers learn their profession very largely at the expense of the children. The objection in the small school to the pupil-teacher is that if he is to do his work for the benefit of the children he must have a very large amount of supervision from the head-teacher, whose work is thereby interfered with, and even then his work is the more mechanical part. In fact, by putting in a pupil-teacher it seems to me you interfere too much with the teacher's own opportunities of teaching the remainder of the children directly under his charge. It may be said that if you give an assistant at 36 you are overstaffing the school; but I hold that it is very doubtful whether you could maintain that it was an overstaffed school. There are from six to eight classes; they may be reduced possibly to five by grouping, but I do not see that you can reduce them below that. There is no question of overstaffing; you can relieve the pressure in a school with a sole teacher, as I hope it will be relieved very shortly, by differentiating the syllabus for the town and country schools, although by differentiating the work in schools where the ages of the children are from five to fifteen does not take away the difficulty altogether. The teacher has not really the time to give that supervision to a pupil-teacher that an ordinary pupil-teacher in a country school would require without inter-

fering with his own work. When you come to the difference of cost—I have not worked it out exactly—the cost of giving assistants, instead of pupil-teachers, in schools of 36 and upwards may amount to as much as £15,000 for the colony.

7. *Mr. Weston.*] £15,000?—Yes. However, by doing that you are benefiting substantially one-fourth of the schools of the colony. The proposed scale gives an assistant teacher when the average attendance at a school is 36. The next thing is the proportion of pupil-teachers to adult teachers. The proportion of pupil-teachers to adult teachers, taking the whole colony, is, in my opinion, too large for real efficiency. In considering the proportion there are three things to be considered—the cheapness, the efficiency, and the supply of teachers. The proportion, roughly speaking, is about two and a half adults to one pupil-teacher. The proposed scale gives 3·85—not quite four—adults to one pupil-teacher. It has been suggested by the Educational Institute, in a resolution forwarded to the Minister, that there should be five to one. In the London schools the number is about 4·6 to one, the tendency being to reduce the number of pupil-teachers. The proportion in Birmingham is four to one. The proposals would give in the schools of 20 and upwards one pupil-teacher for every three and one-third adults. At present in such schools we find one pupil-teacher for every 2·12 adult teachers. The different districts vary. The supply of pupil-teachers at present being trained in the colony, if they all continue—at all events, for a reasonable time, in the course of their profession, would give too many teachers, even making allowance for the female pupil-teachers who fall out in the natural process by getting married, and so on. The proposed staff of pupil-teachers, numbering 778, is about the number that is required to keep up the supply after you add to it the number of teachers who would come into the profession without being pupil-teachers. The number of pupils intrusted to each teacher is too large for much individual attention. I hope, Mr. Chairman, as I refer to individual districts in New Zealand, I shall not be thought to be making an invidious comparison. It has been said—I do not express any opinion upon it—that in Otago the salaries of the teachers of small schools have been higher than in other districts; thereby you increase the efficiency of the teachers you attract; that is the natural consequence. It has been further said that such teachers can deal with a larger number of children than the teachers who are less salaried, and who are presumably a little less skilled. This statement is sometimes quoted as if there was no limit to it. The pace of the class depends not only on the skill of the teacher, but depends also on the receptive power of the child. It does not matter how you teach, or with what amount of skill you exhibit a fact or process, or how you analyse the method of teaching, inevitably there is a limit to the number of children of average capacity that a teacher can teach with efficiency, though it is very difficult to define the limit. The whole direction of modern education is that you must give fewer pupils per teacher if you are going to carry out an efficient scale of staff—it necessarily means that. Taking all schools in New Zealand, the average number per teacher is 30½, and in schools of 20 and upwards 32, or, I should say, nearly 33. The proposed scale gives 29·2 per teacher, and in schools of 20 and upwards 31·1. Taking London, Birmingham, and Glasgow, all of which are moved by the most forward ideas—and I might include Manchester—we find a more liberal staffing; the number in London per teacher is 34. If you take the schools in New Zealand that correspond to the schools taken for the figure 34—that is, schools above 250—the proposed scale, which is a little more liberal than our existing scales of staffing, gives 38 pupils per teacher. This is as far as the finances will allow us to go. In Birmingham the number is 34. Taken all round, and considering what they are doing in schools of the same kind in England and Scotland, I think we are not going too far in proposing to make the staff more liberal than it is at present. The next point is that the proportion of pupil-teachers in large schools in some districts is too high. Attention is called to that in the last report of the Minister of Education. The most striking instances are in infant-schools. I think they should be staffed more strongly: my opinion is very pronounced about that. A case in point is that of an infant-school which has two adults and eleven pupil-teachers. Under the proposed scale the number of adult teachers is always in excess of the number of pupil-teachers. In large schools, where the schools are large enough to be in a sense double, and the classes are in two divisions, the harder division to teach—containing the pupils of lower attainments—is given to the teacher, and the smaller and more advanced portion of the class is given to the pupil-teacher. That kind of arrangement is also carried out in schools where two standards can be grouped together, and the adult and pupil teacher can change about from time to time. This can be done if you do not make the number of pupil-teachers exceed the number of adult teachers. For the December quarter, 1899, head-teachers numbered 1,645; assistants, 896: the total adult teachers, exclusive of sewing-mistresses, 2,541; pupil-teachers, 1,022. That was the actual staff. The proposed scale of staff would give—Head-teachers, 1,645; assistants, 1,354 (or adult teachers, exclusive of sewing-mistresses, 2,999); and pupil-teachers, 778. I presume that a scheme like this would take four years to work out fully—that is, until the present pupil-teachers' courses run out. For the fourth year the full supply of certificated teachers would be available. I have here a table showing the staffing of schools in the various districts, and in certain Australian Colonies, which I will place at the Commission's disposal [Exhibit 6]. Coming to salaries, I do not think I need really go in detail into the matter of the comparison of salaries, for it will come out in evidence given in the several districts. I have here a table of the maximum salaries payable to headmasters [Exhibit 7]. The lowest salary, according to the scales prevailing in New Zealand, is £70. I am leaving out schools under 20. In aided schools salaries a little lower than that are actually paid. The highest salary shown for a school of 20 in any district in New Zealand is £115. I would suggest that for a male teacher the salary should be £120, and for a female teacher £104. For schools of 100 there is a wide range; the salaries differ from £160 to £225. The proposed scale for New Zealand is £189; there are very few near the £225, and £189 seems almost as far as the money will allow us to go. In schools of 250 salaries of head-teachers range from £203 to £275. I propose to make it £254.

Schools of 600: The salaries range from £258 to £375. For a male teacher it is proposed to make it £324. The average salary for a head (or sole) teacher in New Zealand actually paid is £149 11s. 9d. For the year ending December, 1899, the average that would have been paid if this scale had been in existence would have been £160 11s. Certain figures are given also for Victoria, Queensland, and South Australia. The salary of the infant mistress or first assistant mistress has a very wide range in New Zealand, with a commencing salary of from £42 up to £85. An infant mistress in one district may receive £42; in another district, where she may be called first assistant mistress, £48; and so on up to £85, which is the highest on the scale. The Boards have not in all cases kept to their scales. In saying this, I do not wish to cast any reflection on the Boards; but no doubt they found it difficult to avoid departing from their scales in some instances. The salary paid to an infant mistress in South Australia seems rather low as compared with that paid in the other colonies. According to the proposed scale, the highest salary for an infant mistress is £200, and the lowest one, £80. The next point is rather a difficult one to deal with, and that is the question of house-allowance. As you are aware, in some districts there are a very large number of schools without school residences. Taking only schools with an average attendance of over 20, there were, at the end of 1899, 351 without residences—in Auckland 113, Taranaki 17, Wanganui 38, Wellington 65, Hawke's Bay 29, Marlborough 2, Nelson 22, Grey 9, Westland 5, North Canterbury 18, South Canterbury 11, Otago 3, Southland 19. If in one school of an average attendance of 20, say, the headmaster is paid £120 with a house, and in another similar school the headmaster receives £120 without any house, the salaries are not in the strictest sense equal, and we are thus face to face with a difficulty at once. At the same time, to deal with this question on a sound basis would involve interference with what are the recognised functions of the Boards—interference with the discretionary powers of the Boards; so that in putting forth this scheme I do not propose to touch the question of house-allowance, because it is not proposed to interfere with the discretion of the Boards. You might say the scheme is defective, or would be defective, because it overlooks that point altogether, unless the question of house-allowance, as I would recommend, be taken as a separate question and dealt with on its merits. There are several ways of dealing with it: one way is indicated in the last annual report of the Minister, but only a very partial way, as there was no contemplated interference with the Boards. One way to overcome the immediate difficulty of supplying schools with residences where there are no residences now is to provide that for the future it should be left to the option of a Board as to whether it should build residences or not, according to the circumstances. It seems to me that the Board is in a better position to judge of it. At the same time the Board would take a proportion of its building-allowance in the form of a house-allowance from year to year. The building vote is not all used for capital purposes; part of it is used for strictly capital purposes—building new schools, additions to schools, and residences—and part for repairs and rehabilitation of old schools and other purposes of that kind which are not capital charges, but annually recurring charges. In the same way the Boards may make the house-allowance a charge on their building funds if there were power given to them by legislation to do so. It should be left to the Board whether in any given case it should build a residence or pay house-allowance. I may say I have made several attempts at drafting a scale of salaries. This draft I have now is the fifth. In the first three drafts I attempted to deal with the question of house-allowance in conjunction with that of salaries, but it was a disturbing factor, and, as I stated before, the best way of dealing with the matter is to treat it as a separate question altogether. To give house-allowances where there are no residences would require from £8,000 to £10,000, beginning with the minimum house-allowance of £20. The average that I work it out at is £21 10s. for house-allowance. I do not suggest that house-allowance should be met out of the £4 capitation. Several of the Boards give no outside payments in the way of fees for the instruction of their pupil-teachers. The Auckland Board gives none whatever; Wanganui does; Wellington does in some cases, and in some cases it does not. My own feeling is against it. I think if you are going to have a colonial scale it is much easier to draw it up if you do not disturb it by bringing in extra remuneration of any kind whatever. Of course, it would be open to the Commission practically to include the fees in the salaries. In regard to the general expenses of Boards [Exhibit 10]—namely, those included [see Exhibit 2, page 3] under "General Expenses of Boards"—I might say it is extremely difficult to analyse the returns of the general expenses of Boards. For instance, under the head of "Training of teachers" some Boards put fees for pupil-teachers, while some do not. I hold that fees for pupil-teachers should not be put under the head of "Training of teachers," but under that of "Allowances to teachers." As the result of a very careful analysis of one year, 1899, we found there was a balance of £59,973 available for Boards' general expenses. We have not been able to make an analysis for the year 1900, and I do not know that I could promise to get such a return, even if you asked for it, before the rising of the Commission.

8. *Mr. Weston.*] If the Commission asked for what?—For the Boards' expenses for the year 1900. [Details given by Mr. Hogben, Exhibit 9.] The cost of manual and technical instruction, as far as Boards are concerned, will be met out of the funds for carrying out the new Manual and Technical Instruction Act. With regard to some of the expenses of Boards—allowances to School Committees, and so on—I think I ought to state for the information of the Commission that the Minister has received a good many letters from Boards and School Committees complaining that the amount given to School Committees at the present time is too small. The Boards say that the amounts now given are the utmost that can be given with the money at their disposal. The answer has been that the matter will be put before the Commission when it meets, and I am now conveying that fact to the Commission. Members' expenses is an item that must be met—not a very large item. Expressing my personal opinion in regard to the cost of training teachers, I hope that the Boards will be to a very large extent relieved of that very soon, in regard to the general training of teachers as well as their training in the subjects of manual and technical instruction. Of

course, these things take some time to set in motion, but I hope before very long something will be done that will make it unnecessary for the Boards to draw on their general funds for the training of teachers. As you are well aware, as far as concerns the training of teachers in the subjects of manual and technical instruction, a special sum has already been granted for this specific purpose—a temporary grant until more permanent provision for the complete training of teachers can be made. I think that the cost of examinations to the Boards might be reduced. I allude to the cost of scholarship examinations and of pupil-teachers' examinations. The cost of the latter might be reduced without interfering with the discretion of the Boards if the pupil-teacher courses were more uniform. I may say there is already an examination the papers for which are supplied by the department, but only one Board has availed itself of the arrangement. I think, when the new regulations are in full operation it will hardly cost the Boards anything at all for manual and technical instruction, and is not the intention that it should. With regard to district high schools there is a separate vote, and the difficulties of district high schools have, I think, disappeared. The grant is enough to pay all the extra salaries, allowing the rest of the school to be staffed as fully as if there were no secondary pupils, and without charging any fees to the secondary pupils. That may involve other grants for giving free secondary education; it will certainly not touch any salaries on this scale. Then, there is the question of transition from the old system to the new. I have tried to devise suggestions for this, but the method of transition would necessarily differ in every district, because the present scale is different in every district; and it seems to me that the best thing to do would be to leave to the several Boards the method of transition, it being understood that the Boards should take what I might call the shortest way consistent with efficiency—that is, without dislocating their schools. I suggest that the time allowed for making the transition should be four years. Of course, it might be made in less.

9. You would work it out by degrees?—Yes, the Boards would, the Department giving all the assistance in its power.

10. Do I understand you to say that the new system should not come into operation at once?—Yes; it will be seen that such a system cannot come into operation all at once.

11. How do you propose to gradually work it in?—To gradually work out the number of pupil-teachers in excess.

12. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Or, say, to call them assistants?—Yes, where that could be done.

13. *The Chairman.*] That would be chiefly with regard to the alteration of the staff?—Yes.

14. *Mr. Weston.*] The salaries depend on the staffs?—Yes.

15. You work a hardship in some instances by cutting down the salaries—that is to say, if you bring it in at once?—Yes, if the scheme were brought in at once. Under one system a teacher might be paid a certain high salary, and to bring in another system of staff under which he might not have all those duties to perform, and consequently would not be worth the same high salary—to suddenly reduce him to a salary corresponding to his reduced duties would be too great a hardship. Time should be allowed for his transfer to a position in which he would not suffer a loss of salary.

16. If your capitation grant be worked out upon a scale, and you do not bring that scale into operation all at once, how will you manage?—As I said before, it will have to be worked in gradually. I think it is possible if you make a condition that in no case shall teachers be paid less than they are receiving now. To change the system of staffing suddenly must cause hardship.

17. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Not only to the teachers, but also to the pupils?—Yes. A certain time must be allowed to elapse, and, as I suggested before, the length of time should be four years. Of course, it is possible that some Boards might work into the new system in two years, perhaps by a little transfer of pupil-teachers, but to allow four years as the extreme limit of time is fair. To my mind, the natural method of payment would be for the Boards to pay, as I made clear in my introductory remarks last night. The Boards' officers are acquainted with the movements of the teachers in the various districts, and also acquainted with other facts necessary for the distribution of the money; and as a matter of convenience the thing seems to me to be very obvious. The whole amounts would be paid over as the grants are paid over now to the Boards, and would have to be distributed under one scale instead of various scales. Another point arises now that will come into discussion later on—will probably be brought out in the several districts. Supposing you have a school with an average attendance of 24, under the proposed scale the teacher would be receiving £128; if the average attendance dropped to 17 the next quarter his salary would fall to £90. The question, then, is, How is the possibility of that hardship to be avoided? I have not put forward a definite scheme here, but I am prepared to suggest that the salaries payable, in order to obviate hardships in regard to such a sudden fall in attendance, should not be calculated on the average attendance of one quarter, or even of two quarters, but on the average attendance for the whole previous year, subject to some further condition that if the attendance of a school suddenly rose or fell from one class to another the Board should be asked to take the first opportunity—say, by transfer or otherwise—of putting a suitable teacher in charge, but that meanwhile the teacher's salary, if it fell, should not fall beyond a certain limit. I think there should be a limit to what the teachers lose. If the salary is paid on the whole of the previous year's average the number of schools in which it would vary very materially would be very small indeed, and it is only because the average is taken for shorter periods that there is this variation, for in a place like New Zealand, with a population in which there is such an up-and-down movement, it must always be so; but, of course, there should be a further limitation, for if a school fell from, say, 40 to less than 20 it would not do to go on paying on the whole of the previous year's average.

18. *Mr. Weston.*] Suppose the school suddenly rose, we will say?—Well, then it would be necessary to apply the same rule. I have made a sufficiently close examination of this question, and I find that the Boards generally could not afford to run the risk of paying for the whole year,

though, perhaps, some of the large Boards could do so. The plan of paying on the average attendance for a year would work well for the colony as a whole.

19. Will the £4 capitation grant provide any elasticity to meet those requirements?—If you take the whole colony for a year it would reduce the irregularity to a minimum. In conclusion, although the addition of 5s. to the capitation allowance would not enable the smaller Boards, and some of the larger Boards, as in Auckland—where there is a very large proportion of small schools—to raise their salaries to what may be regarded as reasonable rates, or to cope with other financial difficulties, it may be justly claimed that the proposed scheme enables the Government, with that addition, to improve the staffing of the schools; to increase, generally speaking, the salaries of teachers; and to give the Boards a balance available for their general expenses much larger than, after paying salaries and Committees' allowances, has been at their disposal before. Without urging that too closely to a logical conclusion, I think it is the general effect of the scheme. I should like to make one or two suggestions as to the points in the scheme. On page 5 the scale suggests to Boards that certain minimum certificates shall be required for certain positions. It does not interfere, or does not propose to interfere, with the Boards' discretion to engage a teacher with any certificate. It proposes to make reductions for certificates below the minimum certificates of 1 per cent. for each letter, 4 per cent. for each figure under the certificate. The letter of the certificate indicates literary attainment; the figure of the certificate indicates the marks for efficiency and length of service, the marks for efficiency being given by the Inspectors of Schools. The ranking differs from that given in the regulations. An A5 is held to be equal to an E1, but this scale would not hold that. Those deductions amount altogether to about £10,000. In the total of salaries given in the summary on page 4 of the memorandum the deductions are already made. There would be an incitement to the teachers to improve their certificates, which might be a great advantage. The alternative to that is lowering the salaries all round, so as to give the same total deduction, about £10,000. To give a minimum salary for the teachers of all schools with less than 15 pupils would require £17,000. If the policy adopted in Marlborough and Nelson of establishing household schools and other small schools obtained throughout the colony the cost would be much greater. [Statement read by Mr. Hogben as follows:]

Schools with less than 15 in Average Attendance.

The scale proposes to give £5 capitation for all schools under 15; Committees might be required to make up the salary of the teacher to a minimum of £60 for an uncertificated teacher, or £75 for a certificated teacher. I do not think that the minimum salary for teachers should be less than that named. It would need a capitation of £6 to give the minimum salary for an uncertificated teacher with an average attendance of 10. Even £6 a head would not give the minimum salary for schools of less than 10. In December, 1899, the total numbers of schools under 10 and of schools 10 to 14 in average attendance were respectively 113 and 138, as follows:—

	Under 10.	10 to 14.
Auckland	8	33
Taranaki	2	5
Wanganui	1	7
Wellington	14	12
Hawke's Bay	2	7
Marlborough	36	5
Nelson	24	12
Grey	5	3
Westland	10	6
North Canterbury	4	15
South Canterbury	2	2
Otago	5	21
Southland	2	10

The total number of pupils schools under 10 was 694, and from 10 to 14 was 1,661.

I do not think that it is possible to provide satisfactorily for schools of less than 12 without requiring contributions in money or board and lodging for the teacher from the local Committee. To provide the minimum salaries for all schools under 15 would require about £17,000, or £4,230 above the amount of the capitation under the proposed scale (£11,770). That assumes the number to remain as it is at present; but I would point out that in very many cases the teachers of the small schools, called in some districts household schools, are in reality family governesses, and a policy of paying their salaries would almost certainly lead to a great increase in the number of such household schools. I am sure that this danger is not an imaginary one. If the policy adopted in Marlborough and Nelson were general throughout the colony there would be as many of such schools as there are of all other schools put together, and the cost would be £70,000 or £80,000 a year for these small schools alone. Even the payment of capitation would encourage the multiplication of small schools. It would be found necessary in time to fix a limit below which schools should not be recognised as entitled to Government aid. I think wiser to fix that limit now. The condition that Committees or parents should contribute provides a natural safeguard against the undue multiplication of small schools. I suggest, therefore, that if it is thought that capitation should be given to schools with less than 12 the Committees or parents should be required, by contributions or otherwise, to make up the amount of capitation to the minimum salary.

20. What is the minimum for aided schools in Marlborough?—There is no minimum.

21. *The Chairman.*] That applies to Marlborough and Nelson?—Yes. The power can be given to Boards by legislation to require that the minimum salary shall be paid. Within my knowledge there have been cases that I cannot describe as anything less than "sweating." I know of the

case of a teacher whose travelling-expenses amount each year to over £17, travelling to and from home twice a year. She was receiving £20 as the sole remuneration for teaching three children. Of course, she got board and lodging included. If she had been a cook she would have got £40. The question, then, is, if the Boards be not allowed anything not down in this scale, whether they should be allowed the power of requiring that the salaries in the case of aided schools should be made up to a certain minimum. If board and lodging were given, it might be counted as equivalent, say, to £30. If there were ten pupils at £5 a head, £50 capitation would be payable, and the board and lodging would bring the minimum salary practically up to the minimum I have set down in the scale—namely, £80. The endeavour would be to bring the salaries up to the minimum, whatever the minimum was made. The rest of the details deal with the distribution of masters and mistresses in schools. The number of masters shall never be more than the number of mistresses; that is a condition which should be insisted upon. With regard to pupil-teachers, the Minister, in all new schemes of payment to pupil-teachers, has insisted on the equal payment of male and female pupil-teachers. My personal opinion is in favour of the equality of payment to pupil-teachers and to teachers up to what I would call the living-wage, and then I would differentiate between the salaries paid to male and female teachers. If a man maintains three on an average besides himself, and a woman maintains on an average one and a half besides herself, it seems to me that the excess above the minimum salary in the case of the man should be twice that in the case of the woman—I mean the excess above the living-wage should be double in the case of the male. But, of course, I give this only as an expression of personal opinion, as the question of supply and demand largely enters into the question of salaries of men and women. There have been representations that women's salaries should be the same as men's. The tendency has been to increase women's salaries. With regard to the average salaries for pupil-teachers, they are a little higher than they were before. There is a good deal to be said on both sides with regard to lowering the salaries of fifth-year pupil-teachers. In some districts in New Zealand they lower the salary in the fifth year, and in some they do not. It is very unsatisfactory that the practice should obtain of having a large number of ex-pupil-teachers, called temporary assistants, who are not fully qualified, or are not recognised as being worth the salaries of qualified assistants. I propose to withdraw the proposal to make a reduction for the fifth year, if there is any way of meeting the latter difficulty.

22. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I may say that, in regard to the more important question of staffing, I intend to leave that question to Mr. Davidson; but there is one question with regard to house-allowance. The question of the propriety of apportioning a part of the building vote for the purpose of paying rent is one which I hope the Commission will keep in view and embody in their report. I gather from you, Mr. Hogben, that you are agreeable that, instead of the allowance being used entirely for building purposes, an amount might be placed on the estimates for the purpose of allowing rentals—*i.e.*, house-allowance in lieu of building—where no residence is provided?—Yes; I might say, practically, that, instead of giving what I will call the capital sum for the erection of the house, an annual sum for house-allowance might be given.

23. In reference to the expenses of Boards, do you think they ought to be fixed by Act—*e.g.*, ought members' allowance and expenses to be fixed by Act?—I think it would be more convenient for the Boards to fix the expenses. The circumstances vary very much. I think the Boards would be capable of drawing up suitable scales.

24. *Mr. Davidson.*] I should like to ask you, Mr. Hogben, is it a fact that out of the 1,645 schools in the colony, 1,408, or 87 per cent., are schools under 100: that is for the December quarter, 1899?—Yes.

25. Up to 150 I find 1,492 schools, or 90 per cent. of the total?—Yes.

26. It follows, then, that if we prepare a satisfactory scale of staff for the schools in the colony at an average of 150 we should pretty well have broken the back of our task. What does the scale of staff allow to schools in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, or Queensland up to an average attendance of 50?—First of all one teacher, and then one teacher and pupil-teacher.

27. In staffing in the Australian Colonies or in New Zealand is a mistress allowed, where there is an attendance of 36, in addition to the head-teacher?—No, not at 36.

28. *Mr. Weston.*] What number?—40. There are five Boards in New Zealand which begin with an assistant.

29. *Mr. Davidson.*] What would you give as the staffing in Otago, for instance, for schools between 30 and 50?—Otago gives an assistant at 51.

30. From 51 to 75?—Yes.

31. With regard to Southland?—Southland begins with a pupil-teacher.

32. Is it a fact that in Southland a certificated assistant to the head-teacher is not allowed until an attendance of 75 is reached?—Yes, that is right.

33. 75 to 100?—Yes.

34. In Otago, I think I am right in saying, a certificated assistant is allowed at 51 to 75?—Yes.

35. Then, the Southland scale is not as liberal as that you suggest, as far as that class of school is concerned?—No. I have no hesitation in saying that my proposal in regard to those schools is more liberal than is the usual practice. My opinion is very firm, and has been so for a good number of years, and is confirmed by that of a good many others with whom I have had conversation.

36. I wish to bring out this point very clearly: that Otago allows an assistant mistress at from 51 to 75—much earlier than Southland?—Yes.

37. In Otago the schools of between 50 and 75, having two certificated teachers, are considered the easiest to manage of any grade of school in the education district: is that so?—Yes under the present conditions of the syllabus.

38. That is the opinion, I believe, of educationists?—Yes, because a good many educationists require a lower standard of individual training than I should think desirable.

39. In such a school, striking the average between 65 and 75—say, 63—would that be right?—The average, as a matter of fact, taking the actual numbers in such schools in the colony, would be below 60.

40. We will say, suppose the average of such schools to be 60: the great majority of these schools are schools of two rooms, one in charge of a mistress, or first assistant, if you call her by that name: what proportion of the children would be under her charge—what proportion of the 60 in Standards II. or I.?—The practice differs in different districts; some put Standard II. under the master, and some under the mistress. I should say that, generally speaking, if she has Standard II. she has the majority.

41. Suppose she has the infants and Standards I. and II.?—She will generally have more than half.

42. A proportion of 33?—Yes, that would be a fair proportion.

43. And the headmaster will have how many?—A little under 30.

44. Could you say 27?—Yes.

45. A headmaster in charge of 27 children from the Third Standard upward should manage them with great ease—greater ease than a teacher in charge of the whole of the classes, where there was an equal average of 27?—Yes.

46. Why should we introduce a mistress at 36?—You are assuming the same syllabus.

47. It was stated this morning there was a probability of lightening the syllabus?—Yes, for the smaller schools.

48. Looking at the scale of salary from 35 to 75, we find the headmaster gets a fixed salary ranging from £150 to £174: what is the present salary for such schools in, say, Southland?—The present salary for such schools is £141 for 36, and £169 for 75.

49. In Otago in a school of from 50 to 75 what would be the headmaster's salary?—From 51 to 75, £180. From £150 to £174: the Otago scale is rather more there.

50. In your opinion, would it not be better to have the schools graded, say, 20 to 25, with a fixed salary, rather than any variation of capitation grant between 20 and 25?—That opens up a very big question. The whole question is as to whether you make the increments by jumps or gradually by capitation. The jump you make does not very much affect the possibility of drawing up a scale. As far as the scale is concerned, giving the teachers of schools between 20 and 35 an average salary of £135 has the same effect as giving them salaries varying from £120 to £150. I have the very highest respect for the teachers of the colony; but I think you must recognise the temptation there is when you get to the limit of 35 to make the number 36—to stretch everything in order to get into the next class. I do not think that a teacher would be so inclined to do that for the sake of a shilling a month as for, say, £15 or £20 a year; you must take the degree of temptation into account, and it has been found that that temptation really exists. Fortunately, I may say for the integrity of the teachers there is very seldom anything irregular found, yet I do not think it fair to put that temptation in the way of young teachers whose moral dispositions are not altogether developed. The difficulty is got over in some of the other colonies by the transfer of teachers when schools increase so as to pass into the next grade; but there are hardships connected with that too, such as the breaking-up of homes, and a good many teachers would rather go without an increase than break up their homes. After considering the question from all points of view, I think it is much better to have a capitation allowance.

51. Suppose we take a specific case, and say that the salary in a school of from 15 to 20 was £84 a year, or £7 a month, and in a school of from 21 to 25 £90 a year, or £7 10s. a month; do you think that the temptation of 10s. a month would be so great as to cause teachers to falsify their registers?—I hardly think so; it is a question of degree; but for a school of 20 to 25 you ought to give a salary of £125 at least.

52. If the gradation from group to group were not so great as you suggest the temptation would disappear?—Yes.

53. Is it a fact that schools are graded in that fashion in most of the districts of the colony, and also in the Australian Colonies?—In several of the districts of the colony.

54. The great difficulty will be in formulating a scale of staff in the schools between 30 and 75, and the rock upon which this suggested scale will split will be probably in that connection. By having a little less liberal staff, instead of introducing a mistress at 36, let it be at 50 to 75, which is recognised to be a very easily worked school; and, according to the suggested scale, you would give a pupil-teacher as well as a mistress?—No, that is from 75 to 100; I say, from psychological reasons it is utterly impossible to work satisfactorily a school with a sole teacher with an average attendance as high as 50.

55. Take those of 76 to 100: what is the suggested salary for the headmaster under your scale?—From £174 to £189.

56. And the mistress, or female assistant?—The first female assistant £85.

57. What does the same female teacher receive in Otago at the present time?—To answer questions of that sort I should like to have the figures with me.

58. In the Otago scale of staff from 76 to 100—that is, headmaster and mistress without pupil-teacher—what do you consider would be saved yearly: I understand you propose to add to the present class a pupil-teacher?—Yes; the amount would be £36.

59. If it is possible to do the work satisfactorily, that £36 might be divided between the headmaster and the mistress, and by increasing the salary of the headmaster you would induce teachers to enter the service and to remain there?—My own opinion is very strongly against anything of the kind—of giving no help, as I said before, for psychological reasons; you may remove it from 35 to 40, but I hold that 35 is the highest number that should be given to a sole teacher on an ideal system of staffing.

60. Is it a fact that it is a more liberal staff, very much more so, than is given in Victoria?—Yes; but it is a question of money, and the point is in which direction the money shall be spent: some of it must go towards strengthening the staff. I hold that when you come to the question of giving assistance you have to consider what form that assistance should take. My opinion is that it should certainly take the form of a certificated teacher.

61. Your suggested staff for a school between 76 and 100 is headmaster, female assistant, and pupil-teacher?—Yes.

62. I know it is fact that until recently the number placed under a headmaster and mistress in Otago might be as many as 110, and that only recently the Education Board lowered the number to 100?—I may say that the experience of the teacher is not the only thing to be taken into consideration. The question of the number of pupils to be allotted to each teacher has been discussed and tested in Germany, America, and England. It ought not to be more, in the easiest circumstances, than between 30 and 40 per teacher.

63. I should like to know, if you would give it me, the staffing for a school of 420 to 480 in your suggested scheme?—Headmaster, fixed minimum salary, £301; infant mistress, £140.

64. And the number of male assistants?—As few as you like; there need not be any at all; you may have all females if you like.

65. You do not provide for a distribution of the sexes?—We say that you need not have any male assistants at all if you like—that is, according to this scale.

66. You need not have any male assistants on the staff?—No, except the headmaster; the matter is left to the discretion of the Boards.

67. Will you kindly tell me how many male teachers it is possible to have if the Board thinks fit?—You cannot have more than three male assistants, if the Board chooses to appoint them.

68. How many female assistants?—Three, including the headmistress.

69. And pupil-teachers?—Five pupil-teachers.

70. In such a school as that, what would be the number in the infant-room: would there be 145 children?—The average number in the preparatory classes would be about a quarter—that is, if there were 420 in the school there would only be 105.

71. We will suppose there are 120: an infant mistress and two pupil-teachers might very well manage that department: is that not so?—No; two adult mistresses and two pupil-teachers would be the proper staff.

72. What is the salary allotted to the first assistant master in that grade of schools?—£190.

73. At present in such a school in Otago he receives from £210 to £220?—Yes.

74. Any first assistant in a school over 450 would lose £30 a year?—Yes.

75. And the second male assistant in that school would get?—£100.

76. You said it was possible to have three male assistants in such a school: what would the third male receive?—£80.

77. Do you think that £80 is not very much too low a minimum for a certificated male teacher?—For the reasons I gave before you should begin both male and female at the same minimum salary.

78. Is it not a fact that in Otago even the present scale of salary is much more liberal than this?—Not more liberal up to 35.

79. What is your opinion on the importance of the position of the first male assistant?—The first male assistant is paid a higher salary than the others because he has to take the headmaster's place when he may be absent; he has to act as lieutenant. It is a good salary, if you leave Otago out of the question. In Otago they have a larger number of pupils per teacher than anywhere else in the colony. My opinion is, if you increase the number of pupils per teacher—an opinion I hold strongly, and for psychological reasons—you make the work more mechanical, and therefore destroy the value of the training.

80. If it were pointed out to you by the Inspectors, who have been in Otago for a large number of years, that this staff—one headmaster, three male assistants, three female assistants, and five pupil-teachers—was somewhat more liberal than the present, and that such a school could be worked very satisfactorily with three pupil-teachers instead of five—it would be precisely your staff as far as the assistants were concerned, but with fewer pupil-teachers?—Then I should say put on another female assistant. Of course, if that opinion were expressed to me I should respect it as the experience of men who had been working for a long time; but I should certainly not agree with it.

81. Suppose we try 600 to 660: could you give me the staff?—Headmaster, three male assistants.

82. Not more than three?—No; three. There must be a majority of female teachers on the staff.

83. How many females, including mistress?—Five.

84. And pupil-teachers?—Seven.

85. The total number would be sixteen?—Yes, with an average of nearly forty pupils each. South Australia is nearly the same.

86. Would it not be a stronger staff with, say, headmaster, six females, three males, and five pupil-teachers?—You might change two pupil-teachers for one adult: that would depend on the way you organized the school.

87. Taking from 420 to 460—I omitted to take the number of males—there would be headmaster, three males, three females, and five pupil-teachers, a total of twelve: is that so?—There cannot be more than two male assistants there.

88. There is no school in New Zealand, or very few indeed, where the sexes are separated?—There are not very many.

89. The first male assistant would take the Sixth Standard?—Generally speaking, yes.

90. The second male would take the Fifth, usually a class with an average attendance of 50 or more; the third male the Fourth, admitted to be a very heavy standard, with an average of 50 or 60 pupils: would it not require three male assistants to carry on those admittedly heavy classes, the Fifth and Fourth especially?—Yes.

91. I should like you to express an opinion whether, as a rule, a female teacher can successfully manage a large Fourth Standard: is it not better that a male should be in charge?—Yes, I think so; if not the first assistant, one of the male assistants.

92. *Mr. Stewart.*] Mr. Hogben, the order of reference assumes the desirability of a colonial scale?—Yes.

93. I would like to ask you, are you of opinion that a colonial scale is advisable?—Yes, decidedly.

94. Would you mind emphasizing one or two grounds on which you think that a colonial scale is advisable?—One of the reasons is simply a sense of justice. I cannot help feeling a sense of the injustice there is in the fact that a teacher in one district is paid 50 per cent. higher than a teacher in another district. Another thing that is more easily measured is this: that if you pay teachers in some districts higher salaries (of course, it is a question of compulsion, for the Boards generally cannot afford to pay some teachers salaries as high as those paid by some Boards) it is undeniable that the teachers will go to the districts where they are more highly paid; and it amounts to this: that the children in one district will not receive so good an education as the children in another district. If there is not paid an average salary, a sufficiently high average salary, the profession is lowered everywhere. The profession in New Zealand—I will put it in a negative way—is not attracting to itself at the present time the men we might expect to be attracted, except in very small numbers. Again, of course, if a man wishes to be a teacher, if his disposition is to teach, if he is really an enthusiast, he will teach no matter how low a salary he is paid; but there are a certain number of people whose choice is determined by the prizes. If you lower the salary you spoil the prospect, and you lower the profession. If the salaries in New Zealand are not raised the inevitable tendency will be one of two things: that the whole of the schools will be either staffed entirely by women, or nearly so, or that the standard of the profession will fall; and, if I may undertake to prophesy, I think the tendency has already begun, for young people of ability are not coming forward as might be desired. I think it will be a very bad day for the country indeed if we cannot get the same class of teacher as hitherto, for I think that we have very good reason to congratulate ourselves on the quality of the teachers we have here. At the same time, if something is not done the whole educational progress of the country will go back.

95. You are probably aware that in America some such process as this has gone on—*i.e.*, that the male teachers (who are in the great minority) very often belong to a class of young men who aim at getting into one of the learned professions, notably the law, and who use the schools as stepping-stones to the university colleges: have you observed that tendency growing up in this colony?—Yes; promising young men use the teaching profession as a stepping-stone to other professions.

96. Is it not a fact at the present time that every year shows a growing disproportion between the male and female teachers?—Yes, but that is common throughout the world.

97. You think there ought to be a sufficient number of prizes in the profession?—Yes.

98. Do you think that the highest salary attached to the largest schools in the scale you have drawn up can be considered a prize to draw the best men in the profession—£388?—Yes; it is as much as we can afford.

99. It practically comes to this: that under the scheme which you have laid down as a basis for discussion there is one prize of £388 for the whole of the teachers of the colony, and so on; therefore I would like to press this point very strongly: you are not of opinion that there is really a sufficient number of prizes to enlist the best young men in the profession?—I think that in one sense there are; it depends upon the standard you set up. If you want embryo Chief Justices, there may not be. Of course, there are the Inspectorships open; I regard them as part of the teaching profession.

100. Can you tell us how many schools there are in the colony with an average of over 500 carrying a salary of £313?—Thirty over 510, carrying a salary of £319 or upwards.

101. Is there not some provision in the regulations as to gazetting of certificates that you, as Inspector-General, may examine the credentials of any candidate from Australia or Great Britain?—Yes, we have to do that.

102. I believe some ten or twelve years ago there were a great many applications from Great Britain?—Yes; fourteen or fifteen years ago.

103. Within the last year or two have those applications been coming in like that?—No; they are dropping out altogether.

104. What is the condition obtaining with regard to payment of teachers in Great Britain nowadays: is the tendency to have larger salaries?—The general tendency a year or two ago was to rise very quickly, but the present tendency is to rise much more slowly. In some cases London has gone back really, though I consider that the salaries paid in London, Glasgow, and Birmingham are higher than in New Zealand.

105. Since we are not getting outside teachers to come in, it must either follow that we shall have to educate more male teachers, or else we shall be placed in a serious difficulty to obtain male teachers, seeing that your report shows a falling-off of the male teachers coming into the profession: does that not tend to show that the present occupants of positions in the schools of the colony die or are leaving the service, and that it will thus put the colony in a difficult position to fill their positions?—I do not feel disposed to go into that at present. As a rule, the male teacher teaches for life, the female only for a few years.

106. Can you tell me approximately how many male students there are in the training-colleges at Dunedin at the present time?—I could not tell you without looking it up.

107. You do not know, for example, the truth of this statement—which I believe is perfectly true: that there are twenty female students in the Christchurch Training-college to one male?—No, I have not heard that.

108. At any rate, our main difficulty in the colony is in regard to getting a sufficient number of males?—Before I commit myself to that statement I should like to go into the details.

109. Is not the average age of the occupants of the present positions rising very fast?—I have not gone into all those questions. There is a sufficient number of certificated teachers to fill all positions at the present time.

110. Is it not a fact that when teachers of either sex get to the age of sixty to sixty-five the capacity of dealing with young minds very sensibly declines—I put the question from a psychological point of view?—I say, from a psychological point of view, much earlier.

111. Then, it follows, from your opinion, that when you get somewhere near that age there ought to be a system of retirement?—Yes; either by a pension scheme or by some form of superannuation allowance.

112. Would it not be easier to provide a system of retirement of either kind if there were a colonial scale rather than if there were no colonial scale?—I think if there were not a colonial scale it would simply mean adopting the rates of an insurance company. If there were a colonial scale of salaries it would be easier to get a superannuation scale.

113. *Mr. Weston.*] How many teachers are there in New Zealand in employment?—2,541 employed in the primary schools.

114. Without pupil-teachers?—Yes.

115. *Mr. Stewart.*] The order of reference which we have here, of course, compels the Commission to deal with the question solely from the £4 capitation grant?—Yes.

116. Is it not a fact that the expenditure *per capita* has risen all over Great Britain, and is in excess of our own capitation allowance of £4?—I should not like to say it was everywhere.

117. I am speaking of the School Boards—progressive School Boards?—I should not like to say it exceeds £4.

118. Could you give the figures?—I could give them roughly.

119. What do they include?—It does not include the cost of the administration of the London School Board: the cost of inspection. I do not think it fair to make a comparison unless I make an analysis.

120. *Mr. Weston.*] Could we ask Mr. Hogben to analyse these returns for the Commission?—I will do so. I have seen it stated in English newspapers of high authority—I think, in the *Journal of Education*, and also in the *Practical Teacher*—that it is considerably in excess of £4 per head.

121. *Mr. Stewart.*] You have made a provision here that in certain classes, if the schools reach a certain size, the teachers may be male or female?—You can have as many females as you like, but not as many males.

122. Since you have made such a difference in the salaries of males and females, would not there necessarily be a tendency to take as few males as possible?—This estimate of cost was based on the Board taking as many males as they could.

123. If that were not so this estimate would be in excess of the actual cost?—Yes.

124. The Boards are not bound to take these male teachers; they may take more female teachers?—Yes.

125. If they were to do so, is there a sufficient supply of males?—Yes.

126. On the registers—not at present employed?—There are some not at present employed.

127. What class of schools do you consider that a female sole teacher, or head-teacher, is best adapted for?—Apart from exceptional cases—for instance, where there are a larger number of big boys—I think up to schools of 25, or, if necessary, up to 30.

128. Do you not think that in many country districts a female teacher could manage 40 to 45 as well as a man—as sole or head teacher?—Well, yes; but not the average woman. I would not put the average woman there. I do not think the physical effort required would be too great; but the school begins to grow in difficulty about that stage, and there are often more big boys to control.

129. As far as the school-work is concerned, you do not think there would be any difficulty?—No; if the female has assistance.

130. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] A male assistant?—Yes; junior assistant.

131. *Mr. Stewart.*] In the larger schools, where you would expect the greater number of males to be required, did you take into consideration that you would confine male teachers to boys' classes, and female teachers to girls' classes?—Some have mixed classes throughout; some have the boys' and girls' classes in the upper part of the school, separate. In Christchurch we find conditions more nearly approaching those of the London School Board, in which infants, girls, and boys are in three distinct departments. The division is fairly complete, the headmaster exercising a general supervision.

132. That is the Australasian system?—Yes, to a large extent; it is the system in Christchurch. In London and Birmingham it goes a little further still—practically there are three distinct schools.

133. Did you consider those facts when you drew up that scale?—Yes, I did. I recognise the points raised by Mr. Davidson were pertinent. That is why, for instance, I propose in some cases to substitute for two pupil-teachers an assistant.

134. I notice that your scale particularly deals with the question of certificate: at the bottom you say, "subject to certain deductions"—two deductions?—In the majority of cases you find only one deduction has to be made.

135. Is it not a fact that the majority of the schools in Dunedin are officered by D1 men?—Yes; I feel I should be safe in saying so.

136. Is it not a fact the same thing occurs in Wellington? Take the Clyde Quay, Te Aro, and Newtown Schools?—The headmaster of Clyde Quay has a D1 certificate; the other two have B1 certificates.

137. I think we may take it for granted that a large majority—75 per cent., I think—of the largest schools of the colony are officered by men whose certificates would be penalised by the scale?—I could not tell you at the present moment; we worked it out just lately; the total number of deductions is not large.

138. As far as Auckland is concerned, is it not a fact that the schools are officered by D1 men?—I could not say straight out; Richmond Road is not, Nelson Street is not. I think the others are D1.

139. Do you not think that our system of certificates is an unnecessarily complicated one?—I think it would be possible to do all the work that a system of certificates should do with a very much simpler system.

140. Then, you answer the question in the affirmative?—Yes. There would be great difficulty in changing any system of certificates; you would need to work the old into the new.

141. I cannot help noting this: you admit, in answer to my question, that in your opinion the system is not sound, yet at the same time you founded your scale partly upon it?—I think that is hardly a fair statement of what I intended to convey. I did not say that the system was not sound; theoretically, I think it is very good, with one exception. I said I think it is an unnecessarily complicated one. The only point of unsoundness about it is that it attaches too much weight, in my opinion, to the literary qualification.

142. With regard to the syllabus, you said, in dealing with this question in your main statement, that in the future you would have something after the English and Scotch code: in the event of that taking place in the small schools, do you think there would be the same necessity to begin with an assistant at 35?—There is also this qualification: it does not matter by what process you are teaching, or what is the method of the teacher, it is the dealing with the child's mind that takes time and limits the number of children that can be taught effectively. It is not altogether the number of subjects; it is the number of mental movements—the brain movements—each child has to go through.

143. What you practically mean is this: that there is the standpoint of judging by examination results or by what psychological results may follow?—I think we have overdone the idea of judging our education by examination results.

144. *Mr. Weston.*] You would not dispense with examinations?—No; of course, we cannot dispense with them, but we must make them more rational.

145. *Mr. Stewart.*] Is it not a fact that what the teacher wants to do is to guide the child by moral and educational influence, and let the natural activities of the child be developed simply by doing something of itself?—That is one side of the question.

146. *Mr. Luke.*] I had a letter of complaint from the Auckland teachers complaining of the jumping from one scale to another: I take it that in the scale we have before us, showing the increase by capitation the objection is removed?—Yes; for a school between 15 and 19 the fixed salary is £75, with £2 capitation for every one over 14; so that for a school of 17, for instance, the salary would be £90, or £75 *plus* £15; for a school of 19 the salary would be £75 *plus* £25 = £100.

147. *Mr. Weston.*] There is a capitation allowance from one number to another?—Yes; the scale is continuous.

148. *Mr. Luke.*] We have 113 schools in Auckland with no teachers' residences attached; to my knowledge for the last twenty-three years they have been petitioning the Government to build these residences: I should like to know your opinion about it?—The building vote is supposed to cover the cost of building residences as well as schools. I think it is a question for the Board to settle.

149. In regard to the pupil-teachers, I think the scale is rather low—first year, £20 *plus* £10; second year, £30 *plus* £10, &c.—it seems to me hardly enough for male pupil-teachers?—It is higher than the average now paid. You must remember that they are practically apprentices learning their trade.

WEDNESDAY, 24TH APRIL, 1901.

Mr. HOGBEN'S examination continued.

150. *Mr. Luke.*] I have one other question I would like to ask Mr. Hogben, and that is what effect will this colonial scale of staff and salaries have on the Education Boards? Will they be deprived of their privileges, say, from an administrative point of view?—No. I think I am quite safe in saying that I know of no intention on the part of the Minister, and certainly there is no intention on the part of the department, to interfere in any way with the functions of the Education Boards, except—I will say this—perhaps in regard to the question of centralisation of the inspectorate. Other than that, I keep nothing back whatever.

151. *Mr. Stewart.*] I understand that Mr. Luke wants to know if, in your opinion, the work of the colonial scale, automatically as such, will tend to interfere with the functions of the Boards, their prestige and administrative powers?—I say I do not think so. In framing this suggestion I have endeavoured to avoid any possibility of doing so, unless, of course, it were considered the function of the Boards to say what salaries they should pay their teachers. I do not consider that that is interference with the administrative powers of the Board. I might say, Mr. Chairman, I have statements here, based on the London School Board's report, ending Lady Day, 1900.

152. That is exactly thirteen months ago?—Yes. [Figures and statistics quoted by Mr. Hogben from the report to be handed to the Commission, showing relatively the various details in

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 6⅔ 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.

180. If you had all these schools below 15, and an application was sent to the department that there was an attendance of all such schools of so-many, the amount could be paid easily without reference to the capitation allowance, and would not be a disturbing factor, would it?—If the schools remained the same size always it would not be a disturbing factor.

181. You allow the same salary in schools of 15 to 19, where a male or female teacher may be employed with a minimum of £80?—The same salary up to a school of 20.

182. On page 5 you say that the proposed salary of a teacher in New Zealand for a school of 20 is £120: here you give it as £118?—There is a capitation of £2, so that it is £118 *plus* £2.

183. The Boards to have the appointment of teachers as now?—Yes; subject to the conditions in the Act.

184. They may appoint either a male or female, at discretion?—Yes.

185. I suppose when the Board appoints a male the salary will vary in a school over 19 and under 35 from £120 to £150, and in the case of a female from £104 to £134, or a difference of £16?—If the male be a single man he has not such a large salary.

186. You recognise that a school between 20 and 35 can be worked £16 cheaper on your own scale by a female than by a male?—Yes.

187. How many schools are there in the colony with an average attendance over 19, but not over 35?—Last year there were 483.

188. Who will have the difference of salary, assuming the Board appoints a female instead of a male? Will Boards or the Government?—The assumption in drawing up this estimate is that the proportion remains as it is at present.

189. Would you prefer to see in schools of from 20 to 35 a male or female teacher?—It depends on the physical strength of the female in a school above 20.

190. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] And I suppose upon the locality?—Yes.

191. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you consider a school understaffed at 35 with one teacher?—I think it is a very great strain upon a teacher if he has all classes, and I should certainly begin there with an assistant.

192. *Mr. Weston.*] How would a pupil-teacher or a monitor do at 30?—I have seen monitors both in England and here, but I do not think it is desirable to use monitors.

193. *Mr. Hill.*] How many do you consider an assistant master ought to be able to teach—say, pupils of the same standard?—It depends on the standard you adopt as to the amount of individual attention that should be given. There is individual attention even in class-tuition, and it is a question which must enter largely into the matter of staffing. Another factor is the standard of intelligence you expect to develop. The question is a difficult one, but I think the number of pupils per teacher should be somewhere between 30 and 40—that is, in one class of the same standard. In London the number per teacher is 34. The proposed scale is more liberal than the existing ones.

194. *Mr. Davidson.*] Would not the strain upon a teacher to secure attention in a class, to maintain order and discipline, be very much greater in the London schools than in the schools in New Zealand?—Yes; I think there is an element of truth in that, at all events. I will say, in some of the London schools. Of course, it depends on the class of schools. In the smaller schools in London, mostly situated in the suburbs, schools of 250 or so, it is quite as easy as in New Zealand schools. Children of tradesmen, artisans, &c., go to these schools, and they compare fairly well with the children we have in our schools.

195. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you think a woman could manage a school between 20 and 35 as efficiently as a man could manage it in regard to the matter of discipline and training?—The two things are quite distinct.

196. But would you put men and women on an equality? Do you think that a woman could manage a school below 35 equally with a man?—I think it would be a case in which the Board should have the choice as to whom it should appoint. The local circumstances differ. On the ground of discipline, take the average school in New Zealand: my experience, gained in England and New Zealand, is that the New Zealand child does not require so much strain on the part of the teacher in order to preserve order and discipline. Generally speaking, a woman would not have much trouble in regard to discipline.

197. Have you found from your own experience that there is less efficiency in schools below 35 controlled by mistresses than in schools controlled by masters?—The efficiency of teaching depends on the individual. You can get very good discipline and very fair teaching sometimes without reaching the highest point of efficiency. I think that, generally speaking, not only as regards the question of discipline, but as regards teaching, at about 30 it is better to start with a man. But I say, without reserve, a woman could manage a school up to 30, and with very few exceptions up to 35.

198. You say a woman must hold the same certificate, and you propose to penalise her in the same way for classification?—Yes.

199. Do you find that women obtain their certificates more easily than men?—That is a rather difficult question to answer. You can only judge on a large scale by the candidates presenting themselves, and by the number of failures. I say that women do not obtain their certificates so easily.

200. You recognise that women must work as hard as the men to obtain their certificates?—Yes.

201. You are equally satisfied they could manage a school up to 30?—Yes.

202. And, under special conditions, up to 35?—Yes.

203. If women have to toil like men, why do you propose to penalise them?—Because the average wage-earning woman has not so many depending on her, and you must take into account the number of people dependent on the wage-earner.

204. But the moment she gets married you dismiss her?—I do not say so.

205. As you propose to differentiate salaries for man and woman, why not do so in the case of pupil-teachers?—Because in that case the allowance is below a living-wage.

206. Do you think it would be better to give a larger salary and employ better teachers in smaller schools, by requiring them to teach up to, say, 40 pupils?—I hold very strongly that we should keep down the number that we give to the unassisted teacher. Keep the number down as low as we can, and by doing so we benefit a large number of schools. You could not reduce the number of classes to less than five classes if you had children from five to fifteen years, and it is a great strain on the teacher; and not only that, but I think we should give the best teaching to these children in schools of from 20 to 35, where there are 12,948 children.

207. *Mr. Davidson.*] How many schools?—483.

208. *Mr. Hill.*] Supposing women were to be employed in schools below 35, what saving would there be on the two scales?—I do not know exactly, though, speaking roughly, the saving would be about £3,840—that is, by employing women in all schools between 20 and 35.

209. *Mr. Stewart.*] That amount would be a saving between the two modes of staffing the schools?—Yes.

210. *Mr. Hill.*] You propose to add an assistant in the case of every school where the average attendance exceeds 35?—Yes.

211. Would it be possible, do you think, to work such a school with two female teachers—a principal teacher and a lady assistant—instead of a male principal teacher with an assistant?—Well, it depends on what is expected of the teacher. The teacher now is expected to teach drill, and it is evident that the drill of the boys would not be so efficient under the average female teacher as in the case of the male teacher.

212. You want males to teach calisthenics?—To teach drill; and then there is the teaching of woodwork, which you could not expect of the average female teacher. Manual instruction should be co-ordinated with the other subjects of the syllabus; and, taking these things into consideration, I think perhaps it is better to lay down the general rule that there should be a male assistant if possible—that is, where there is a female head-teacher.

213. Do you think it possible to adopt any other plan in order to produce efficiency in these schools—say, raising the school-age to six or seven years, and increasing the capitation allowance in the same proportion?—I should not be prepared to recommend raising the school-age. I did think so at one time, but experience has shown me that it would not do. It would mean practically reducing the numbers and reducing the school-life of a child. There would have to be an increased capitation.

214. If you have £100,000 capitation, assuming that you took out 10,000 children, that takes away £40,000, and you simply say that the remaining children would have to produce that money: would it not strengthen the schools?—If you have a scheme founded on any capitation you are met by the fact that you cannot get an efficient teacher below a certain minimum. If you reduce the number of children per school you are at the same time increasing the expense per head.

215. In your tabulation, except between 250 and 300, you increase the staff as follows: For each increase of 30 in average attendance, one pupil-teacher; for each increase of 60, one assistant. Is this proposal better than is now found in any of the education districts?—The education districts are not quite uniform. Some districts are much more liberal than others. In schools under 300 the numbers proposed would be 50 and 25.

216. Below 300 you give an assistant for every 50?—Yes.

217. Then, is your proposal better?—It is more liberal on the whole.

[Mr. Hill's further examination of Mr. Hogben was deferred until the reassembling of the Commission in Wellington.]

THURSDAY, 25TH APRIL, 1901.

Mr. HOGBEN'S examination continued.

[Mr. Hogben handed in a return—Exhibit 10.]

218. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Mr. Hogben, I think you expressed the opinion, on more occasions than one, that you considered the teachers were required to do at the present time rather too much work: do you consider that 35 to 36 pupils are enough for a sole teacher—you have not considered that a large majority of the teachers will be willing to do more work than what your proposed scale sets out, in order to get higher pay?—I should like to say, in regard to the first part of the question, it is not so much that the teachers are doing more work than they should do, it is because of the large number each teacher has that the work assumes too much of a mechanical form. I do not think they are doing more work than we should expect them to do, or more than they expect to do. Generally speaking, teachers belong to an industrious profession; I think they are doing a very reasonable amount of work. The character of the teaching becomes more mechanical on account of the larger number of pupils; it is not the effect alone on the teacher, but the effect on the pupils.

219. How do you account for the fact of there being so few male teachers in the service at the present time? Is it not on account of the cheapness of female teachers, the inclination of Boards to appoint female teachers, and the fact that very few avenues are open to girls?—There are several causes; the last cause you indicated is perhaps the greatest of all. The phenomenon itself is by no means peculiar to New Zealand or the United Kingdom; it is not peculiar to English-speaking people, but it is a general movement all the world over that the proportion of female teachers is tending to increase. I would quote the remark made by the Hon. E. Lyttelton, president of the Headmasters' Association (?), in January last. He said it was the privilege of a

president to prophesy, and it was a question of time, not only in the primary schools, but even in boys' secondary schools, when mistresses would to some extent take the place of masters. It is simply an index of the general tendency that is taking place everywhere, and I think it is an index of prosperity too. If the pay of teachers were higher men would be attracted from the other professions; but it would take a much higher rate of pay than you are likely to get under any scale; it is not only a question of the present pay, but of the future pay. Look at a boy in an office, for instance: he is considered fairly well paid for the first two years at 10s. a week, but it is not the question of pay that induces him to enter the office; it is the fact that it launches him into business.

220. *Mr. Weston.*] In some respects is not the headmaster of these schools responsible for the selection of the female over the male pupil-teachers?—It might be so in a few cases, but I think generally the headmaster is anxious to get a good proportion of male pupil-teachers.

221. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You consider, according to your reply to Mr. Davidson, that a scheme of superannuation or retiring allowance as far as the Education Board is concerned, is impracticable without their taking advantage of the insurance companies?—I think the number of teachers we have is below the minimum the actuaries would accept. I do not think they would take less than 10,000 lives.

Mr. Stewart: I think that answer was in reference to my question. My argument was that a time should arise when the teachers should be compulsorily retired; for the Government to devise a scheme of satisfactory retirement.

Mr. Hogben: In reply to Mr. Gilfedder's question, I simply express that, as far as my general knowledge goes—knowledge which is, I suppose, common to the rest of the Commission—to make a separate and safe scheme for insurance we should have a larger number of lives than we have.

223. *Mr. Davidson.*] Is it not a fact, Mr. Hogben, that in South Australia, where they certainly have nothing like 10,000 teachers, they have arranged a superannuation scheme for the teachers of the colony?—You mean the State promises to make up the amount or guarantees the payments.

224. *The Chairman.*] A State scheme?—Yes.

225. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You suggest to make a reduction in the salaries for teachers' certificates—those below the minimum. There is no provision to give a bonus to those of higher certificates?—No.

226. Do you think it is equitable that this liability to reduction should apply to teachers already in the service, or should it apply to those who will be appointed after this system comes into vogue?—I myself feel very strongly on that. I see arguments both ways for it. It was partly in order to offer inducements to teachers in some of the best schools to take up the profession for life. There are points of injustice, though; it might seem to interfere with the discretion of Boards in the appointment of teachers indirectly; it does not do so directly. There are plenty of teachers, in spite of all certificates that you could draw, with lower certificates, quite as good in every way, and also as regards literary attainment. Sometimes Boards go very much further in the positive direction—this is what I call the negative; they give larger salaries for higher certificates—for instance, Wanganui and Wellington.

227. *Mr. Weston.*] Sometimes a teacher might be a little affected by age?—Yes. In spite of all efforts to the contrary, we have not succeeded—nor do I think we are likely to succeed in the present state of things—in giving a uniform system of marking by Inspectors. In districts where Inspectors took a liberal view the salaries would be a little higher. In the thirteen different districts there are different men, so is there a difference in the views taken.

228. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] I think, Mr. Hogben, you forestalled my next question with regard to the centralisation of the inspectorate. You know, I suppose, that the Inspectors at a conference passed a resolution in favour of centralising the inspectorate?—Yes.

229. You consider that there are a rather large number of pupil-teachers in the colony?—Yes.

230. This only pertains to a few education districts?—Yes.

231. Your idea is to place assistants in the schools instead of pupil-teachers: where will you get your assistants from? I think you said the training-colleges; but what opportunities will young people have on the West Coast, in Southland, and such districts of getting training-colleges?—Give them scholarships in order to come for their training to the places where the training-colleges would be established.

232. *Mr. Weston.*] How many need there be?—Four.

233. Would the cost of these scholarships come out of the £4 capitation?—No; quite distinct altogether. To supplement that the Minister indicated in his report there would have to be at every place where there was an Education Board training classes for teachers who could not get scholarships.

234. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you not consider it would be more satisfactory if all the teachers' examinations were conducted by the department? At the present time you require to keep terms, and teachers are under a great disadvantage. The head-teachers of our main schools in the colony are Class D1. They have not had the opportunities the rising generation have at the present time of attending the university and taking a degree. I consider that the examinations should be conducted by the department up to Class A?—Your question is to some extent based on a misconception of the circumstances. It is not necessary that a teacher who wishes to get Class A, &c., should fulfil any of the conditions required by the university. He can sit for the examination just the same as if the department held it; it is not necessary he should keep terms or anything else.

235. Do I understand from you that a candidate may take a group of subjects, such as political science, for the M.A. degree, and if he pass with first- or second-class honours, he will get a Class A certificate?—He must take subjects that will give him a B certificate first. He could do it, certainly; a great many Cs have done it, and one or two Bs.

236. Are you in favour still of continuing the present examination for Class D through the matriculation?—That is also based on a misconception; a pupil does not necessarily get D by passing the matriculation. It depends upon the paper; we only recognise subjects *quantum valent*—that is to say, they still have to pass the special subjects required for a teacher. Before the end of the year new regulations for teachers will be issued. Of course, it is not an easy question; we do not want to increase the cost of examinations in the colony.

237. *Mr. Luke.*] A teacher may get his A degree without being an M.A., and his B without being a B.A.?—Yes that is so.

238. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you think it possible to secure unification of the educational system of the colony—to make the high school more accessible to the children from the primary school, and a stepping-stone into the university, so that pupils might more easily pass from the primary schools into the secondary schools, which in turn would be stepping-stones to the university?—I should like to say that greater facilities should be given to the children in the primary schools of getting instruction in the secondary schools, and thence into the university. They have at present the stumbling-block of high school-fees.

239. I see that where a sewing-mistress is employed the head-teacher loses £10?—In a school of 20 the mistress gets £104 and the master £120, and he has to give £10 to a sewing-mistress; if he be married, his wife, if she qualifies, can be appointed, so that it is hardly robbing him of £10.

240. You give the mistress the full £104?—Yes.

241. Would not the master be engaged for the whole week for his salary of £120 a year, as well as the mistress for her £104?—You see, it is this way: In about five hundred schools in New Zealand there is a mistress in charge, and she teaches sewing; they are mixed schools, and the boys do arithmetic and other work she may set them.

242. You admit that in the case of the head-teachers of some of the larger schools the scale of salaries will mean a reduction in the salaries they are getting at the present time—such as in Auckland and Otago?—No, not in Auckland.

243. Could you tell us the number of schools at which the average attendance is between 36 and 45?—I do not think I could just now.

244. *Mr. Stewart.*] In reference to your answer as to the passing for D certificate by matriculation, is not the real crux of the question the fact that it is the age of the candidate that has really the main effect on the examination—you would not allow a boy of fifteen or sixteen to score by a crammed-up paper for matriculation? Your idea is that in the new regulations the age-limit should be taken away?—Not the age-limit for the passing of the examination. One of the best sources of supply for male pupil-teachers would be the high schools, especially those who had come right through from the primary schools; but from one cause or another they are not encouraged to do so. The Boards have the right to appoint them as second- or third-year pupil-teachers, but I have seen a boy get a scholarship—first on the list—go right through the high school, up to four years, doing as well as he possibly could do, and then find there was very little hope of his being appointed as a second- or third-year pupil-teacher.

BLENHEIM.

SATURDAY, 27TH APRIL, 1901.

Captain BAILLIE, Acting Chairman of the Marlborough Education Board.

Captain Baillie: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen,—I recognise the object is to equalise the teachers' salaries in proportion to the work they have to do. I recognise that the teachers throughout the colony, especially in very many of the smaller districts, are very inadequately paid considering their work, and also that they have little or no prospect of making any provision for their old age. The Board in Marlborough has been in existence twenty years—since the Act came into force—and it has been struggling on year by year, with its small schools in the Sounds, which are a very heavy tax, on a £3 15s. capitation grant. We started with a balance to our credit of about £800, but that balance has gradually dwindled down to a mere bagatelle. I have no doubt our secretary, Mr. Smith, will show you the annual report, which will furnish all the information you want. I have always looked upon it that a teacher in a small settlement, where there are about forty children, is comparatively underpaid and overworked, having to take all the standards, when compared with teachers in larger schools in other districts who perhaps have only two standards. Of course, we understand that to bring about the equality in the salaries is a question of money, and if the colony is prepared to put its hand into the purse and give a distribution equivalent to the work done it will be very desirable.

2. *Mr. Stewart.*] I gather from your evidence that you are distinctly in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salary?—Yes, most decidedly.

3. You are of opinion that it is absolutely necessary in the interests of the small Boards?—Yes.

4. You say, with the capitation grant of £3 15s., it has been a constant struggle with your Board from the commencement, and that your credit balance has gradually decreased?—Yes, that is the case.

5. You know it is proposed by the order of reference that the capitation shall be £4 instead of £3 15s.?—Yes, I gather that it is so.

6. Do you think that if this matter were merely on a capitation basis it would meet the difficulty, or are you of opinion that it should not be on a capitation basis?—I think the capitation basis the fairest basis. The smaller districts would want some aid, especially in Marlborough.

7. The Sounds schools are the chief difficulty in regard to your finances?—Yes; they are a very heavy drag.

8. You have no large school on which you can save capitation?—No; they barely cover expenses.

9. You have been a member of the Board for a long time?—Yes.

10. Is it in your experience that you get a sufficient number of your young men offering for the profession, or are you confined to female teachers?—With the exception of two or three boys who have been bred in the borough schools, I do not think we have had others offering from other parts, and two of our boys have gone elsewhere.

11. Two out of the three have drifted away from you?—Yes.

12. How is it that these young men do not offer: are there so many avenues of employment open, or are there any other inducements?—There are inducements offered by banks and other employments, in which they have a better status than they could obtain in the teaching profession.

13. *Mr. Hill.*] You say, Captain Baillie, that the small schools are carried on with a very great loss by the Board?—The very small schools are.

14. You have made calculations with the intention of showing that such is the case?—Yes.

15. I see in your regulations, on page 9, "Scale of payments to aided and household schools": that, according to them, if you have a school of 25 the cost to your Board would be about £82 10s., would it not?—Somewhere about that.

16. Is that as much as you would receive on the 25, with the capitation of £3 15s.?—I have not calculated it.

17. The cost here is £3 6s. on the small schools, on which you say there is a great loss?—With the exception of two schools, whose average may come up to 25, the others have only an average of 5, 6, 7, or 8, and it is these I refer to as the drag. I dare say a school of 25 in number would pay its way.

18. How many schools have you with an average below 10?—Thirty-nine.

19. And it is those schools which are carried on with a loss?—Yes. I might say that in the scattered districts of the Sounds, in places where there are not more than an average of 4, 5, or 6, these household schools are attended perhaps by the families of two neighbours, who put up the schools.

20. Your desire is to foster these schools, and give them more assistance than you have hitherto?—Yes; it is desirable with a free education system.

21. Over and above the amount of capitation now paid?—Yes.

22. What do you suggest as a fair amount to be paid to those schools?—Well, in 99 per cent. of them there are female teachers.

23. Would you give them a fixed amount or a capitation allowance?—I think a fixed amount would be more satisfactory. If a teacher received £60 a year it would be of great benefit to her.

24. What average attendance should she have to receive £60 a year?—I think an average attendance of 5 or 6.

25. You would say £60 for that attendance?—Yes; there is a lot of work attached to teaching six children at different stages.

26. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you think there is a great waste in dividing the sexes in this main district school?—Yes; there is a great waste of teaching-power, and money, contingently. When the question came before the Board fifteen or twenty ago I strenuously opposed the division of the sexes. I have seen large schools in Otago of 400 and 500, mixed schools, and have observed no injurious effects. In America not only are the schools mixed, but the universities too.

27. Would your Board be in favour of establishing mixed schools here as in other parts?—I can only speak individually; the thing has not been mooted for some years, and then it was on the motion of the borough School Committee that it was brought up.

28. Speaking as a stranger, one cannot see any reason why your children are not as good and pure as those in other parts of the country?—If there is any immorality it does not take place in the schools, but in the streets and highways on Saturday evenings.

29. Your opinion is that mixed schools could be established here on the same lines as in other places?—Yes.

30. The question of the large grants to a small number of schools has been brought under your notice: what is the motive for establishing so many of these household schools?—The geographical conditions of the country; the inaccessible spurs among which the greater number of these schools, thirty in number, are situated. You might, by water, pull across from one bay to another in ten minutes or a quarter of an hour, but to go by land takes very much longer—an hour or two.

31. So that it is impossible to have the schools closer, more centralised?—Yes.

32. The proposed £4 capitation grant, in your opinion, would not make much difference to your schools?—It would relieve them to a certain extent. There are many things which the Board is only too anxious to do, but which, owing to its crippled means, it is not able to.

33. I suppose, in the establishment of a colonial scale of staff and salaries, you, whilst wishing to see salaries in one education district improved, would not like it to be at the cost of another education district?—No.

34. You think the £4 capitation grant will not give you in this district what you require to place your teachers in the position they ought to be placed in, and that if the Government makes due provision for your district it should not be at the expense of others, or such as to reduce reasonable salaries in other education districts?—No; there must be an equal scale throughout the colony, without benefiting one particular district to the injury of another.

35. You, as an old and distinguished member of our Legislative Assembly, would be prepared, if the £4 capitation grant would not be ample, to support more in Parliament?—The question does not come into the Legislative Council; the House of Representatives would have to decide that question.

36. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you think that your Education Board has established too many of these aided or household schools?—We cannot avoid it; we get an application that there are four or five children, their teacher is appointed, and we simply confirm it. The appointments are only temporary ones, just as long as there are enough children to give £4 or £5 a head. From what I can see, the householder generally finds the food, and the money the teacher receives goes for her clothing.

37. I see the average attendance ranges from 3 to 10. Were other Education Boards throughout the colony to establish aided or household schools under similar conditions they would have less funds at their disposal. Have these schools in the Sounds been established on the recommendation of the Inspector?—Yes; he inspects the district about twice a year. He knows the wants of the people, and he states to the Board what is required.

38. You stated, in reply to Mr. Mackenzie, you did not consider the £4 capitation grant, if paid to each Education Board, would have the desired effect in the case of weak Boards, such as Marlborough?—I said it would assist them to a considerable extent.

39. Under one or two of the strong Boards of the colony the teachers in certain grades of schools get very large salaries, much larger than they would get under the colonial scale, on the adoption of which they may get a little less, and the smaller and weaker Boards a little more; a few shillings saved from the largely populated districts means a very considerable item to the weak Boards?—Yes; and that is the scheme as far as I understand it.

40. How do you get on in this district with regard to house allowance?—In most places the teachers have houses; as far as I remember, there is an allowance of £40, the assistants getting no house allowance.

41. Sewing-mistresses appointed in your schools of from 30 to 54 get £12 a year?—Yes.

42. Is it not a fact that the sewing-mistress is expected to teach a class or two in the school?—In some of the schools such is the case; in the smaller schools I do not think it is the case; it varies according to circumstances.

43. You have no difficulty in obtaining the services of female pupil-teachers, but you have as far as male teachers are concerned?—We have plenty of female teachers. The bulk of them are probationers, beginning at £16; some of them we keep on from year to year after their term has expired.

44. Does your Board discourage the employment of male pupil-teachers? If there is a vacancy is preference given to the female?—I think generally the male gets it; the School Committees are in favour of males, because they think they exercise greater moral control.

45. What about the sewing?—If the man is married his wife may be appointed sewing-mistress.

46. Do you not give preference to female pupil-teachers on the understanding that they teach the sewing?—I do not think that has been considered by the Board.

47. In regard to assistants other than pupil-teachers, have you any difficulty in getting these assistants?—We get plenty of applicants, but whether they are good teachers is a very moot point. I would rather take one of the ordinary pupil-teachers and put her in the position than take one from outside.

48. *Mr. Luke.*] In regard to the division of the sexes, do I understand that in your public school it was done at the request of the School Committee?—As far as my memory serves me it was so; at least fifteen years ago.

49. Then, the Board established that system at the request of the School Committee?—Yes. There was a good deal of bitterness about it, and a lot of political animus at the bottom.

50. *Mr. Hogben.*] With regard to figures—the expenses of the Board, and so on—I suppose it will be better for me to ask Mr. Smith those questions later on?—Yes, I think so.

51. Speaking of the reasons that have actuated the Board in setting up these small schools, have you considered the fact that at many of these small schools the children are of the same family, and practically you are aiding the settlers to keep private governesses?—Yes; very often the school may be composed of no more than the actual family.

52. So that they are really private governesses?—Yes.

53. I suppose the wife, the mother of the family, would not be able to teach reading, writing, or arithmetic?—No.

54. Would you be prepared to recommend such a system throughout the colony in the Legislature, as far as you can express an opinion?—I consider that I look upon it from an enlightened point of view, speaking on behalf of the Marlborough Board, and I do not think we are singular.

55. You have thirty-nine schools under 10, out of the total of 129 for the colony—a very large proportion?—Yes; but the other parts of the colony are not similarly situated with these Sounds districts.

56. They have isolated homesteads in other parts?—Yes.

57. If the same policy was adopted you would be prepared, as a legislator, to support an expenditure of £70,000 or £80,000 a year alone, throughout the colony?—If the public were desirous I think it would be a good expenditure of money.

58. With a £4 capitation the whole of the vote would amount to £450,000, and out of that you would allow nearly £80,000 for these small schools: do you think it would be a wise policy?—I think so; it would be an enlightened policy, though no doubt it would be a heavy tax on the colony.

59. Do you not think, in the case of any school under 15, it would be wise to fix a minimum salary to be paid to any teacher recognised by the Board?—It would be very beneficial to the teacher no doubt, for they have a very small allowance.

60. For an uncertificated teacher what salary would you be inclined to fix—£60?—£50; an ordinary servant would get £25 for household work.

61. £50 besides her board and lodging?—Yes.

62. If £4 a head capitation were given you would not get that £50 until there were 13 pupils?—Very few of our small schools would have 13 pupils.

63. Your small schools have an average a little under 6?—Yes.

64. An average of 5·7, and you would lose very heavily on those?—Yes.

65. In the interests of teachers and of education you think there ought to be a fixed minimum salary?—I think it would be a wise thing.

66. In that case what would you think of the expediency of requiring, in money or in board and lodging, a contribution from the parents in order to bring up the income to the minimum salary?—It would be desirable, but I think it would be a heavy tax on them.

67. Suppose you had 6 and we gave £5 a head, that would come to £30?—Yes.

68. If you had a minimum salary of £80 you would want £50 more?—Yes.

69. And if you counted board and lodging as £30 you would want a money-contribution of £20: do you think that the principle would be right?—The principle is good; if we do not earn £40 or £50 by capitation we would have to make up the difference.

70. You think the contribution could not come from the parents?—No; the parents are not equal to it.

71. In that case, if you gave a capitation of £5 per head, and fixed a minimum salary at £60 for an uncertificated teacher, as soon as there was 6 of an average attendance the capitation grant would amount to £30?—Yes.

72. And if the board and lodging were equivalent to £30 they would be given a teacher?—Yes.

73. You would not recognise any school under 6 unless the householders contributed, otherwise it would come out of the colonial revenue—or, rather, out of the revenue of the Boards, though the Boards would expect to get it from the colonial revenue?—Yes.

74. *The Chairman.*] You say, Captain Baillie, that a large number of the household schools in this district are in places very remote from each other: how long have those schools been in existence?—Some of them fifteen or twenty years; they have gradually increased. When the Board first came into existence the whole of the schools in the district numbered only about nineteen.

75. It is virtually, then, within the last ten years that these schools have become so numerous?—Yes; say fifteen at the outside.

76. The people whose families are being educated in this manner are mostly sheep-farmers?—Most of them have sheep, some have cattle, some a small block of land.

77. Are any great proportion of them in a position to send their children into the larger schools in Picton or Blenheim to receive what might be considered a superior education?—There might be, perhaps, one or two of them.

78. Judging from the report of your Inspector, have those schools proved successes, so far as the children are concerned?—I think so; they seem satisfactory. They are composed of nearly all young children of from five to ten years of age. As soon as they reach the ages of twelve or fourteen they go to work, help on the farm, and so on; they do not receive much more education.

79. Very few of them pass the higher standards?—Very few indeed.

80. What is the highest standard of education they receive before they go to work?—Generally the Fourth Standard. It is even so in the larger schools of the colony.

81. Do you think an uncertificated teacher qualified to give them education up to the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Standards if they had the opportunity to receive it?—There have been pupil-teachers in some of the schools qualified to pass the children up to those standards—nine-tenths of them, I should say. Many of them hold an E certificate, I think.

82. Are there many males among those teachers, or are they nearly all young women?—I should say at least 90 per cent. are females. Now and then we have a male, who is perhaps out-at-elbows, and cannot get a school owing to one of the failings of human nature; but several whom I could mention have done excellent work.

83. These young female teachers live with the families, and are virtually governesses, performing domestic duties?—Most likely they do assist in many ways.

84. They are entirely at the mercy of the families with whom they live?—I fancy so.

85. Notwithstanding the report your Inspector may give as to the quality of the education, they are liable to be dismissed at any time without the sanction of the Board: the Board has no control over her?—No; we get a resignation, some one else is appointed, and that is about the long and the short of it.

86. Supposing the parents were required to contribute to the support of those teachers independently in a building alongside the school, do you think many of those schools would be in demand?—I cannot say; most likely the householder would not be in possession of funds to do so.

87. If the Board itself was to assist them in erecting schools with small residences attached, do you think the parents would be prepared to contribute to the support of the teacher fairly?—I do not think so; one or two of them might.

88. Are we to assume in cases of this kind that it is on account of services outside of their duties as teachers that those governesses are boarded and lodged free?—I fancy so.

89. You have said, in reference to pupil-teachers, that there are very few males offering themselves?—I cannot at the moment call to mind the name of one male pupil-teacher.

90. When vacancies occur in any of your schools have you any difficulty in finding female pupil-teachers: there is no dearth of girls?—Not at all; we have plenty of girls.

91. The state of things exists here that you have more applicants than what you can find employment for?—I think so. I know there is no difficulty in getting them.

92. Returning to the question of the household schools, are you aware of any of the teachers there who are members of the family receiving instruction?—I think there may be one case in the Sounds where there is a daughter teaching, or there may be two; I cannot speak from personal knowledge.

93. You have expressed the opinion that a teacher in a small school, teaching the whole of the standards, has as much work to perform, and in many instances more, than the assistant of a larger school, who receives, very often, a larger salary?—Yes, that is my opinion, as I expressed it before.

94. Would it be practicable to employ a steam-launch in order to bring those families into one centre—to centralise them?—No, I do not think so.

95. If the Board considered the expediency of adopting a system that prevailed in parts of the Old Country at one time of having what is called a "hedge" schoolmaster, travelling round from place to place, how would that do?—I do not think it would be practicable.

96. You do not see any way of remedying the present state of affairs except by increasing the allowance to those "aided" schools?—That is the only remedy—money.

97. *Mr. Stewart.*] I understand, Captain Baillie, with regard to this question of separating your public school into two divisions—a boys' and girls'—that not so very long ago your Board endeavoured to have that matter remedied, but that the School Committee objected, and you gave way?—When the school was first established both the sexes were taught together, a matter of fifteen years ago.

98. The question never came before your Board a second time?—No; the question was this: Supposing there were 400 children in the school on which we were paid a capitation grant, the School Committee brought it forward that, the school being divided into two, a boys' and girls', they really got a capitation from the two—say there were 250 in one case and 150 in the other, they were entitled to capitation on the scale which was laid down.

99. So that the School Committee really made a rise out of it?—Yes. I may state, in conclusion, that a member of the Board receives no emolument, no travelling-expenses, or allowances in any way.

RICHARD MCCALLUM, Member of the Marlborough Education Board.

100. *The Chairman.*] The Commission will be very pleased to hear anything you may have to say with regard to this proposed colonial scale of staff and salaries?—I understand, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that this document is a suggestion from the Inspector-General, and I may say, on behalf of the Marlborough Education Board, that we are prepared to accept the scheme as detailed by Mr. Hogben. Of course, we think it might be improved slightly in order to meet the exigencies of Marlborough. This schedule is distinctly in advance of what we have been paying. The complaint here among many of the Board school-teachers is that the large centres of population have to pay for the smaller ones; practically we maintain the aided schools at the cost of the larger centres of population, such as Blenheim, Picton, Springlands, and Grovetown. I do not see why the principle should not be extended in order to bring the whole under one colonial scale, fixing the teachers' salaries on a wider basis. Why should not Wellington, Auckland, Dunedin, and Christchurch also contribute equally with the above to maintain the schools in this district? To be logical, if Blenheim has to maintain these other schools, why should not Wellington and the other provinces combine to assist the smaller schools, and also Blenheim indirectly, although Blenheim is a school of 500? The Marlborough Education Board has always attempted to give education to the children of poor people living in localities away from a school; if the children could be sent to any Board school, or aided school, the Board has invariably insisted upon that course. If you look at the map (Sounds map), where there are about thirty aided schools, you will see that it is impossible to have one, two, or three schools to cope with the children in the district. There is not a single aided school solely for the benefit of children of wealthy men. The Board's policy has been to assist the struggling settlers, to encourage people to go out and live in these wilds, and to cultivate their farms, and our appeal to you from the Marlborough Board is that we do not wish you to interfere with the system of aided schools in the Marlborough District. You may make it a separate part of your scheme if you like, but we ask you not to impair the usefulness of the scheme we have established. No doubt the other teachers have just cause of complaint against us, because our scale is the lowest in the colony, but that is on account of our giving education to the children of these settlers. If some scheme is evolved by these proceedings there is no doubt something should be done in the way of raising the salaries of the teachers. The extra capitation of 5s. would no doubt help, but it would by no means meet the difficulty. By payment on a colonial basis there will be a chance of meeting the difficulty. In regard to members of families being employed as teachers in these small schools, there is no doubt a regulation should be framed emphasizing the need for distinction in the appointments to these schools. I do not say that the Board has always insisted upon the non-employment of a member of a family. It seems to me to be very objectionable, a member of a family receiving employment, and should not be done unless there was something special to justify it. Our Board has set its face very strongly against the employment of a member of the family in these small schools. As regards the grant in the past, it has not been sufficient either for building or for the ordinary work of the Board. When I joined the Board some four years ago it had got to the length of its tether, and was face to face with the position of asking for an overdraft. We have never in this district, as in the case of Wellington, for example, expended any of our money

on manual and technical education; our aim has been in spreading the benefits of education, and the Board has no chance of doing anything in the way of manual and technical work. We did establish a shorthand class that did good work for a time, but owing to the insufficiency of the grant that class has fallen through.

101. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You say, logically, the principle should be to extend the surplus profits from the larger schools to the smaller schools: would it not be equally logical for districts like Otago to establish very small schools, as done here, to absorb their own surplus?—It would be only fair.

102. That being so, it would upset the whole question of the colonial scale on the basis on which it is submitted. I am aware that in many parts of the colony, and in the education district I am connected with in Otago, the difficulties to contend with are quite as great as in the Sounds, and we have never established a school for less than 15 or 16 children. Within what distance are some of these Sounds schools located?—I should say, within seven or eight miles.

103. Are not some of them within two or three miles of each other?—I am not aware of it. We certainly should not allow them to be too close together; there is a school or two at the head of Port Underwood.

104. Have you not a school in the next bay—Ocean Bay—two miles distant by good track from Robin Hood Bay School?—I understand there are three schools in Port Underwood. I am personally against them.

105. This must be very carefully guarded against in granting educational advantages in these remote parts. If Otago were to do as this school district has done it would require to spend about £12,000. You say, to be logical, the same principle ought to be extended all over the colony?—I am not saying that it should not; we should not deny to other districts what we give our own.

106. Whilst you stated that your Board was prepared to adopt this scale as submitted, your advocacy at the close of your remarks would involve a very great increase on the basis on which it is worked out—that is, on the £4 capitation?—I said I thought it would take more than £4 capitation to work Mr. Hogben's scheme satisfactorily.

107. *Mr. Hill.*] I notice that you have, according to a return before me, 224 pupils in thirty-nine schools, with averages varying from 1 to 9?—Yes.

108. In Regulation 40 of your regulations it says, "For the first five, £5 per head per annum; for the second five, £4 per head; for the third five, £3 per head; for the fourth five, £2 10s. per head; for the fifth five, £2 per head." Consequently, on those 224 children you lose at the rate of 15s. per head capitation, and on the thirty-nine schools £168: is that so?—Yes.

109. I notice also in the same return four schools with an average attendance of 48, between 10 and 14, and you lose on those four schools capitation allowance of 5s., amounting to £12, so that you have forty-three schools which you work at a loss of £180?—Yes.

110. Against that you have four more schools with an average of 56, and you work them at a gain of £8 5s.; and yet your complaint is that the great loss in your district is in consequence of these small schools, and, notwithstanding all this complaint, you are working these latter schools at a less amount really than the Government are giving you at the present time?—The loss of a few hundreds is a great matter to us.

111. Then, how do you account that you are working them at a loss?—A living-wage only is paid by our schedule, and the small amount beyond this is of great consequence to us.

112. Supposing the Government gave a £5 capitation grant on the small schools below 20, do you think it would be beneficial to your district?—Yes.

113. You find great difficulty in consequence of the small amount of the building grant?—Yes.

114. Have you expended any of the capitation grant on buildings?—No. We have borrowed money from the capitation grant for the Building Fund, but we have always paid it back.

115. You have expended all your capitation grant mainly on two things—payment of teachers' salaries and in assisting School Committees to carry out their duties?—Yes; and in office expenditure, £500 or £600 a year.

116. The office expenditure?—Yes, including the Inspector's salary.

117. But you have a grant for that?—Yes; I am wrong; there is a special grant for that.

118. What do you think would be a fair thing in the matter of a building grant: have you formed any idea?—It depends upon new settlements. Last year the Government made a special grant for two schools.

119. You think that absolutely everything that is required for educational purposes should be given by the Government; that there should be no local effort at all? What do you think of rating, for example, in the case of a district, or Road Board district, where there was a chance of having a school: do you think any rating authority would help that district by means of a subsidy?—It would not be fair to rate for educational purposes; it would be a retrograde policy.

120. I mean a voluntary payment?—I think the British public would revolt against a rate.

121. *Mr. Stewart.*] I take it from the evidence that you are of opinion that a colonial scale is absolutely necessary in the interests of the public?—Yes.

122. Is it not a fact, with regard to the teachers in the employ of your Board, that the average age is rapidly rising?—Yes, no doubt.

123. It is also a fact that there are no male teachers coming on?—From Mr. Sturrock I gather there is only one male pupil-teacher at the present time.

124. With regard to the question of the rising of the average age of teachers, what do you think will happen in the near future?—I think greater inducements should be offered now; that is my opinion.

125. What becomes of your teachers when they get to the age of, say, sixty: do you pension them?—I am afraid we treat them rather badly; they work off our hands like old horses.

126. Do you think, in the interests of the public, that should be allowed to go on?—No; I think, myself, an insurance or provident fund ought to be established.

127. Do you think it is possible?—Yes; though the Marlborough teachers could not be expected to contribute from the present salaries they receive, there should be a teachers' provident fund for that purpose.

128. Do you think that your teachers deserve that such a provision should be made for them?—I think that Mr. Smith's report shows that they work fairly well. There are some very brilliant teachers in this district.

129. It is your opinion that the question of the retirement of teachers, on some basis or other, is one that will press heavily on the colony in the future?—Yes.

130. You have a school at Renwicktown?—Yes.

131. You have another small school at Springlands?—Yes.

132. Then, in addition to the borough schools, you have four schools up to Tuamarina: what is the distance from Renwicktown to the borough schools?—Six miles and a half.

133. And from Tuamarina to the borough schools?—Seven miles and a half.

134. Then, about thirteen miles and a half would be the diameter of a circle, in which the borough is the centre?—Yes.

135. On the larger schools you save money?—Yes.

136. Do you think if something of the American system were brought into operation it would not be better—that is, instead of establishing so many of these schools within a few miles of each other, there should be some mode of conveyance to come central place, an effort to bring about centralisation?—No, I do not think such a scheme would work; the children have long distances to come to these schools.

137. But supposing the State did it?—I do not think it would do. We do subsidise an omnibus between Para and Tuamarina, and it costs us £50 a year—that is, for conveying the children back to Para; in the evening the train does not suit.

138. Do you think it is a decided advantage to those children?—Yes, it is.

139. Do you think a further extension of that system would be still more advantageous?—Yes. I think Springlands is sufficiently large; there are from 200 to 260. In Renwicktown some of the children come two or three miles to school.

140. How far is the Grovetown School from your main school?—A mile and a half from the Blenheim Railway-station.

141. Do you think that is too far to come?—Well, some of the children live another mile and a half down the river, and others nearer Spring Creek, and they meet half-way.

142. Have you any limit that there should be between the schools?—I think the limit is three miles. The regulation says, "The Board will not undertake to establish a school in any district unless within three miles of the intended site of the schoolhouse there are at least thirty children of school-age. No Board school will be established within five miles of any existing school, measured by the nearest road."

143. Was that regulation in force when you built Springlands?—I was not a member of the Board then; from Mr. Smith I gather it was not.

144. I suppose, as a matter of fact, members of the Board are subjected to a very great deal of pressure to establish these schools?—Yes, by the local residents; the parents all round the district petition us.

145. In regard to the condition of some of these buildings, I suppose you will soon have to replace them?—Yes; the Picton School is very old.

146. What about Grovetown?—The teacher's residence there is very old; the school is partly new—by new, I mean it is ten or fifteen years old.

147. With regard to what was told us of the Committee of the borough school subdividing it and claiming capitation on a basis of two schools instead of one, do you think that principle should be extended to the other districts of the colony? Do you approve of the existing state of affairs?—No; the whole school should be entirely under one management.

148. Your present system, in your opinion, does not tend towards proficiency and good management: do you think any question of that sort likely to arise?—No; and in regard to the question of morality, I think nothing of it.

149. What is your definition of a sewing-mistress?—We are very easy-going in that respect. I think any woman can sew; 90 per cent. of them can teach sewing: that is our definition.

150. When you appoint a sewing-mistress, do you appoint her to teach sewing alone, or do you take an elastic sort of definition of the term and say she has to teach reading, writing, &c.?—As a general rule, sewing-mistresses do little more than the sewing for their £1 a month.

151. In a school we went into yesterday we found a young girl who we were told was the sewing-mistress, the attendance being 42: were we correctly informed when we were told that the young girl was the sewing-mistress, receiving £12 per annum, and working five hours every day in the week teaching?—Yes, she was doing the work at her own will and pleasure. The Board do not ask her to do it.

152. What time is she supposed to give to the teaching of sewing?—From Mr. Smith I gather an hour two or three times a week.

153. Then, her employment for the other four hours every day in the week is irregular?—No; it is purely voluntary labour on the part of the teacher.

154. Do you think it would be a wise thing for the Boards of the colony to admit this question of voluntary labour in schools?—No; it should be discountenanced.

155. Your opinion is that your Board is not doing wisely in allowing this state of things?—This is the first I have heard of this affair. I think it is a purely exceptional case, and not a general rule by any means.

156. In regard to the question of colonial administration, when you stated that Auckland Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin should contribute towards the cost of these small Sounds

schools, you do not mean to interfere in any way at all with the Board system, or that it should be superseded by a colonial system?—No; I think the Boards throughout the colony have worked well. The Boards, more than any other local bodies, have men upon them of standing who take an interest in education. We do not think that anything better could be done than to continue the present system of School Committees.

157. You think there should be colonial administration of the finances that are extra charges?—Yes; we leave it in your hands to formulate some scheme, and if you do so our Board will not resent the fact of not being asked an opinion upon the matter.

158. You think that there should be a colonial scale of staff and salaries, and strongly press for it as far as your Board is concerned; and you would like, if possible, some sort of supplementary scheme which would deal with those very special circumstances in which you are interested?—Yes; if there are other districts like the Sounds they should be treated in the same way.

159. You think exceptional circumstances demand an exceptional scheme?—Yes.

160. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you not consider that your Education Board has been too liberal in the establishment of these aided and household schools?—Yes, perhaps we have been too liberal; we should have been personally informed. On one occasion I did raise an objection in regard to Port Underwood School.

161. Is it not a fact that these aided or household schools take in boarders at so much a year?—I think it is rather rare.

162. Is it not the case at Robin Hood Bay?—It was the case some years ago. The main objection was that, owing to unusual advantages in the way of constant superintendence, and so on, they were getting all the scholarships.

163. Do you consider that the Education Board should discourage the system of taking in boarders?—Yes; it should not be allowed.

164. With regard to the system of appointing teachers, does your Board consult the Committees?—Yes; we invariably take the recommendation of the Committee, and we work very amicably.

165. Do you send all the applications of certificated teachers to the Committee?—Yes. The names of those recommended are sent back to us, and we communicate with the Inspector; if we find that the Inspector is unfavourable, we let the Committee know in an inferential manner that it would be unwise to appoint that particular teacher.

166. You have no difficulty in getting female pupil-teachers?—None whatever.

167. Are they appointed on the recommendation of the headmaster?—Yes.

168. Does the headmaster invariably favour the appointment of female teachers?—I think he has no choice.

169. How many pupils do you consider that a female teacher could teach with efficiency?—Each male or female teacher could teach about thirty pupils.

170. You say that there are many schools in the vicinity of Blenheim rather close together?—Yes.

171. Would you experience considerable difficulty if you proposed to close them?—Yes.

172. Do you find that the separation of the sexes means a great waste of teaching energy?—Yes.

173. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you of opinion that in the Marlborough District some of these aided schools are unnecessary?—No, I do not think so. By means of a general scheme we might venture to go into the question with a view to reducing the number.

174. *The Chairman.*] By amalgamation in some cases?—Yes; I am aware of one or two cases where there might be amalgamation.

175. *Mr. Davidson.*] In admitting that, you mean they are practically unnecessary?—Yes.

176. Do you not think that in any part of the colony many of the schools are established owing to local pressure being brought to bear on the Boards?—Yes.

177. And that if a regulation was prepared by the department, and approved by the Board, that such schools should not be established unless with the approval of the department, it would be in the public interest?—Yes. I do not say we are always free from pressure; perhaps we are inclined to give in weakly.

178. I want to know whether you, as a member of the Marlborough Education Board, would approve of a departmental regulation preventing the establishment of aided schools unless with the approval of the Inspector and the consent of the department?—Yes, if necessary, to save the whole system of aided schools. I would sooner see them restricted than diminished.

179. *Mr. Luke.*] Are you aware that in some educational districts, and in Auckland particularly, itinerant teachers are employed in outlying and roadless districts most successfully? The whole of the Great Barrier Island is worked in this way. In regard to half-time schools, with a good certificated teacher, could not that plan be adopted in the Marlborough Education District?—No, I do not think so.

180. *The Chairman.*] You could not get an educated man to "paddle his own canoe," and go from one place to another?—No.

181. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you think that by grouping these small household schools, and employing female teachers to visit several families in the half-time schools so formed, you could considerably reduce the number?—Yes; no doubt the object should be to save the number of teachers.

182. Do you think it possible by this means in your district to reduce the number of teachers employed?—Yes; it would certainly reduce them.

183. I want to know whether you think this system would work in your district?—No; I do not think it would answer on account of the impracticability of travelling, especially when you take into account that the Pelorus Sounds have six hundred miles of coast-line and Queen Charlotte Sound three hundred miles.

184. With regard to these teachers in household schools, you have expressed the opinion that they should not be members of the family receiving tuition?—They should not.

185. Can you tell me how many there are of such cases?—No; Mr. Smith may be able to tell you.

186. Do you think there ought to be a minimum salary for such teachers employed?—Yes; I think a girl should get at least £20 to £25 a year.

187. In addition to board and lodging?—Yes; that is always found.

188. You say from £20 to £25?—Yes.

189. You would give her less than a domestic servant receives?—I think that is about the average wage a domestic servant gets.

190. Do you not think that is rather low?—I think it is a stepping-stone; they begin there and work up.

191. You are not a member of a trades-union?—No, I am not.

192. Were you a member of a trades-union, do you think that would be a fair minimum wage? Do you think a teachers' union would entertain a minimum salary of £25 and board and lodging? —I think it amounts to £60 or £70 a year with board and lodging.

193. I will put it this way: Do you think £25 and board and lodging is sufficient as a minimum salary for a teacher?—At least that; it should be higher if you can give it.

194. Then, you think it should be the minimum salary?—Yes.

195. How much would you put board and lodging down at per annum?—About £40 per annum; not so much in these outlying districts—say £26.

196. Then, you think I am not putting it too low at £30 per annum?—No.

197. Who would find the difference in the minimum salary, in your opinion?—The parents must find the difference; they must make up the salary to a reasonable amount.

198. Do you require that now, say, in a household school with two pupils?—Yes; we simply find the capitation on the two pupils; we allow ten pupils. We do not suppose any girl would teach for £10 a year and board and lodging unless she was very hard-up.

199. You do not require it?—No; the householder first of all employs a girl to come and teach, knowing we will subsidise her board and lodging by so-much.

200. Do you not think it would be desirable to have a definite minimum salary—a fixed minimum salary?—I think it would be. We do not inquire as to how much a particular teacher is being paid in all.

201. *The Chairman.*] The household teachers, I believe, are really appointed by the parents of the children, and the Board sanctions the appointment afterwards?—Yes.

202. Do you think any improvement would be effected if they were appointed by the Board in the first instance?—Yes, I think so.

203. Then, it should not be left to the parents to say whether a teacher will suit their requirements, say, in regard to music, and so on?—No.

204. Is not this a system of subsidising educated servants?—Yes; no doubt the teacher does other work about the house.

205. The returns of the Inspector show that they are performing really useful functions?—Yes.

206. After all, you do not consider the cost of those schools very excessive?—Oh, no.

207. Have you compared those schools in the Sounds—the number of children, the number of schools, and the cost thereof—with the cost of some of the more moderate-sized schools?—No, we have not.

208. What is the cost of the schools you have in the Sounds—I mean the total cost?—£1,300 for salaries only; with other little additional expenses, £1,545; the number of pupils attending such schools, 224. The cost is about £6 per head.

209. You have about forty female teachers in aided schools receiving among them altogether no more than the amount given to one of the larger schools in the other centres?—Yes; there are very few males.

210. What is the reason of so few males offering themselves as pupil-teachers?—The teachers are paid such ridiculously small salaries, and it is getting about that the teaching profession is not a good profession from that point of view.

211. Do you find, as a rule, that Committees prefer males to females?—Yes; I think they always prefer male teachers.

212. What is your opinion with regard to the relative amount of work performed by a teacher in a small school with all the standards and that done by a teacher in a large school with but one or two standards to attend to?—I think, decidedly, that the teacher with all the standards has far more work to do.

213. More responsibility?—Yes.

214. On account of your funds being so limited you are not improving the schools as you would like—that is, keeping them in order and repair?—No; the Committees are told we are keeping the thing steadily in view. The Committees trust to our good faith in the matter, and we are at one with them in what we are doing.

215. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You say that you do not think these household schools should receive boarders?—They should not.

216. Is it not a fact that a good many of the children who go to these seaside schools are rather delicate, and go for their health: should they not go as boarders?—I think the whole system should be discountenanced. I do not think it is right.

217. You think that the Government should do nothing to interfere with the children going to a private school?—They may go to private schools if they please, so long as they get proper tuition. I do not think there is anything to complain of in the Robin Hood Bay School.

218. Does it not seem to you that the adoption of a colonial scale in your district had better apply to the schools other than the aided schools: that all these aided schools shall get £5 capitation, and that the colonial scale shall apply to the others? Would not that get over the local difficulty? —Yes; I think that would be quite fair.

F. Birch, Chairman of the Blenheim School Committee.

219. *The Chairman.*] How long have you occupied the position of Chairman of the Blenheim School Committee?—I have been Chairman at various times, and I have been a member of the Committee many years; the positions of Chairman and Committeeman I should say I have occupied for the last sixteen or eighteen years. I was a member of the Committee long before the division of the sexes took place, at the time when the late Mr. Lucas taught as headmaster most successfully. At that time we had ample material in the way of male pupil-teachers, and it is a matter for regret that they are not obtainable at the present time, for I am sure that the Committee and the Board prefer for the boys' department male pupil-teachers. With regard to the last appointments we made, they were two female pupil-teachers, for, although we had the choice of a male assistant, we knew it was a foregone conclusion we should not be able to get one. My opinion is that the headmaster can do a very great deal towards obtaining male pupil-teachers, providing that a more liberal allowance be made to induce the boys to enter the profession, instead of, as is the case now, seeking employment in a merchant's office or elsewhere, with a commencing salary more liberal than is offered in the profession. With regard to the amalgamation of the sexes, I may say at once I am very much in favour of it. My own opinion is that the Committee as constituted at present will not hear of it; but I do not think they have good and valid reasons for objection. I think it is a standing reproach to this district that there is not that amalgamation of the sexes; the work of the Committee in that respect will take a long time to undo. I think the Commission will do good work if they bring about amalgamation, and also advise that the profession should be made more remunerative for willing boys to enter it instead of being allowed to drift away into other channels.

220. *Mr. Hill.*] You suggest that a larger remuneration should be offered to the boys to prevent them from seeking other situations: do you think any boy who passes through the standards is capable of becoming a pupil-teacher?—Perhaps not every boy; lots of boys who pass through the standards have not the necessary qualifications.

221. How would you propose to limit the choice?—I should expect the headmaster to do so. He should replace gaps in the ranks.

222. Has your Committee ever brought that question under the notice of the headmaster?—No; I think the Committee should call the schoolmaster's attention to a thing of that sort.

223. Is not the question one of adaptability? Possibly he considers there is no one adapted to the position?—Perhaps so.

224. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] The main point, as far as I can see, is the fact that the pupil-teachers are inadequately paid, is it not?—Yes.

225. They commence with a salary of £20 a year, or about 8s. a week?—Yes.

226. Do you not think that if you could provide better salaries for the male pupil-teachers you would attract them into the service?—Yes.

227. At present there is not much encouragement for males to enter the profession?—No, there is not.

228. In regard to your Regulation 20, which says that the headmasters shall be responsible to the School Committee, do you know the meaning of this responsibility?—No, I do not.

229. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Did the late headmaster, Mr. Lucas, manage to secure male teachers at the lower salary?—Yes.

230. That was probably at a time when other occupations were not so numerous?—Perhaps so.

231. So that it was not due to the late teacher's special qualifications?—Yes, I think it was; he took the initiative, and was very much interested in seeing boys enter the service.

232. *Mr. Davidson.*] You admitted, I think, that the present rate of pay to pupil-teachers is altogether inadequate?—Yes.

233. And consequently there is not sufficient inducement for boys to enter the service?—No.

234. Has the headmaster of your school the fixing of the rate of pay to the pupil-teachers? —No.

235. Then, you blame him for not being able to induce boys to enter the service, while at the same time you admit that the salaries are altogether inadequate?—I say more could be done if the salaries were increased, and with the headmaster's assistance.

236. Do you know that the headmasters in other educational districts are not considered responsible for the introduction of boys into the service?—No.

237. *The Chairman.*] Under your regulations probationers for six months enjoy no salary at all?—That is so; I think there have been probationers in our schools for as long as three years without salaries.

238. Do you think that, under those circumstances, big boys would accept service of that sort, seeing that they would be, as probationers, subject to examination, and would get no salary? Does that not render it very clear why boys will not accept appointments of that nature?—Yes.

239. You think the amalgamation of the sexes would be advantageous?—Yes, I am sure it would be.

240. Instead of leading to undue familiarities, or anything undesirable, you think it would have the opposite effect by making the boys respectful and promoting good conduct?—Yes; it is not so much a question of the sexes as of the man who is to teach them.

MARY CAROLINE WILLIAMS, mistress of Marshlands School.

241. *Mr. Stewart.*] What is the length of your experience as a teacher in one of these aided schools in the Sounds?—Three years.

242. Were you in more than one?—No.

243. Which one were you in?—Kekerangu; it is thirteen years since I left there.

244. Have you seen any of the Sounds schools since that time?—I have been in one or two since then.

245. With regard to the question of board, would you kindly say what you think the board is worth on an average to the teacher in these aided Sounds schools?—Where I stayed the people were of comfortable means, and we lived very comfortably in regard to board and lodging. I have several times gone to other places where the living was very rough and uncouth, and the board and lodging worth very little indeed.

246. Is it a fact that board and lodging in many of these aided schools in the Sounds is very unsatisfactory?—I cannot answer for a great many. I was in one or two where it was not satisfactory.

247. I have been told that at the most it was not worth more than 1s. a day: is that so?—I have forgotten; I could not say as to that.

248. What school are you teaching?—Marshlands.

249. Are you in charge?—Yes.

250. Are you in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes; I think we should profit by it; I know I should personally.

251. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] What is the average attendance at your school?—48 for the December quarter, 44 for this quarter.

252. Have you a pupil-teacher?—No; I am one of those who have a sewing-mistress. Though she is called by the name of sewing-mistress she does not do the sewing. Under the regulations of the Board there is something to the effect that, when the attendance increases beyond a certain number, the teacher is entitled to a sewing-mistress at £12 a year. At Marshlands we were the first to get a sewing-mistress, and the Board wanted to know the circumstances of it. At the meeting of the Board Mr. Smith said it was evidently because the word "teacher" was used instead of "master" that we were entitled to £12 a year for extra assistance. I do not require her help in regard to sewing, but it seemed there was no other name under which she could be appointed. As I said, she does not teach sewing, and she does not give a lesson. Her work consists of supervision, watching over Standard I., and the little ones. Since Christmas she has been working in another room, and when I go in that room to teach she comes into my room and supervises any lesson I may give; say, for instance, I start the girls sewing, she will watch over them.

253. *Mr. Stewart.*] She is not called a teacher, though she really is one?—No; she is not a pupil-teacher.

254. *Mr. Hill.*] How many do you think you could teach?—I do not think I could comfortably manage more than 32 with all the standards.

255. If you had one standard—Standard III., for example—could you manage more than 32?—Yes.

256. How many could you manage?—I once taught 60.

257. This young lady who supervises the lessons you set, has she received any training?—No.

258. Yet you make her responsible for the work of the children?—No, she is not held responsible.

259. What instruction does she give in the room where she is alone?—The First Standard may be doing arithmetic; in any case work that she would correct afterwards.

260. Does she take reading, for example?—Yes.

261. Does she give an object-lesson?—No.

262. What are the hours she is in attendance?—9.30 until 1, with an interval, and on in the afternoon till 3.

263. For £12 a year?—Yes.

264. She simply supervises and controls?—Yes; if I had no one there the children would be alone part of the time.

265. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] That state of affairs has to continue until your average attendance reaches 55?—Yes.

266. You heard the Chairman of the Board say that this work was purely voluntary?—Yes.

267. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you think the young lady in your school regards the work as being purely voluntary?—She knew exactly the work required of her when she was appointed. Two girls made application for the position, and I put the position clearly before them. Several members of the Committee wanted to know how the girl could be appointed sewing-mistress when she did not teach the sewing.

268. When appointed she knew the nature of the work she would be required to do?—Yes.

269. *The Chairman.*] The girl was pleased to get the appointment, I suppose?—Yes.

270. *Mr. Hogben.*] Then, the girl did not regard the work as voluntary, seeing that she accepted the conditions as put by you?—No; it was on those conditions she accepted.

271. Do you think you went beyond your duties in telling her what work she was expected to do?—No; I thought it only right she should know the nature of the work expected, and the salary she would receive.

272. What made you think there were those conditions you mentioned attaching to the position?—I had asked the Inspector what he thought the meaning was, and he said if there was a master in charge he would be allowed a sewing-mistress at £12 a year, but seeing that I did not want a sewing-mistress I was entitled to assistance worth £12 a year.

273. Then, Mr. Smith was the source from which you got that information leading you to impose those conditions?—Yes; in the manner I stated before.

274. The sewing-mistress is not a certificated mistress or a pupil-teacher?—No.

275. *Mr. Hill.*] Supposing your sewing-mistress were to absent herself from school for a day, what would you do?—I should expect her to supply a very good reason.

276. For the sum of £12 a year do you expect her to attend every day throughout the year the same as you do?—Yes, because I explained the position clearly to her.

CHARLES C. HOWARD, Headmaster of the Picton School, President of the Marlborough Educational Institute.

277. I assume I am at liberty to take the proposed scale of staff and salaries, point out what I think its good features and its bad features, and give hints that may occur to me as to improvements which it will be possible to effect in it. First of all, I consider the basis of the scale most unfair. I do not believe in making a man's salary dependent on average attendance. It presses very heavily on teachers in this district, and is most unfair. I am able to plead the cause of others more freely, perhaps, than they themselves, inasmuch as it does not affect me at present, for my own salary is not dependent on average attendance. The authorities place a teacher, unintentionally of course, in a very difficult position, in which, under this system, he is liable to be mulcted on account of circumstances over which he has no control. The industries in his district may have worked out, the bush been cleared, the sawmills closed down, the mines abandoned; there may thus be a scarcity of industrial openings, necessitating a migration of population; the younger people have to go further afield in search of homes; the attendance suffers, there are no young pupils coming on, and the teacher is penalised for it. I know of a teacher whose average attendance has gone down through no fault of his own whatever, and yet he is liable to have his salary diminished. If the Government is going to pay on the average attendance, I think steps should certainly be taken to secure to such a man as that transfer to another field of duty, though, of course, it is for the Boards to do it. Then, again, I would ask you to consider how bad weather, bad roads, &c., may act on a teacher's salary; and not those things only, but unappreciative parents. A case occurred within a few miles of this town—a schoolmaster had occasion to report the non-attendance of a child at school; there was a large family of the children, and only one of them was irregular, but that child had to be reported. The consequence was that the mother took advantage of the School Attendance Act, and sent her other children to school only six times during the week, instead of ten, and tried to get other neighbours in the district to do the same thing, in order to reduce the headmaster's salary. The School Attendance Act, in my experience, actually induces to irregularity of attendance. I know parents who systematically take advantage of it. If under such circumstances a master does good work I say he deserves really good pay whether his attendance has gone down or not. Unwise legislation has actually increased the difficulties of the teachers, and then the department proposes to take advantage of it and lower their salaries. In my own school, Picton, the attendance fluctuates greatly. [Witness quoted figures showing fluctuation in attendance.] For the last two quarters the roll was 176; the highest attendance in the half-year being 171, and the lowest 47. At these seaside places there are all sorts of attractions—picnics, boating expeditions, and so forth; on the Wednesday half-holiday parents go picnicking, taking their children with them. I mention these things in order to show how the attendance fluctuates, and also to show that the average attendance is by no means a fair gauge of what a teacher must be considered capable of. The system of payment on average attendance is especially inapplicable to a young country like this, where things are in a state of transition and flux, and where many of the industries are always more or less unsettled. We are in a totally different position from, say, Birmingham and London, and the large cities in older countries. Then, I should like to take somewhat higher ground. I ask myself what was I immediately engaged to do? To teach in accordance with certain regulations. It is surely not my business to supply the material I have got to work up, any more than it would be that of a factory to do so; it is my business to teach to the best of my ability those who come to be taught. It is not my business to go scouring the country to bring children to school. The State establishes schools, provides teachers, says education is to be compulsory, but, having failed so far in perfecting machinery capable of making it so, proposes to punish the teacher. As a means to the better recognition of a teacher's capabilities, it would be fairer to pay him on the highest attendance. The average roll-number would probably be a truer basis still if the purging of rolls were as strictly done everywhere as in Marlborough, and the system of register inspection were as satisfactory. It would be far better still to adopt some such system as prevails in some of the Australian States—divide the schools into certain classes and prescribe a salary for each class of school. But if this cannot be, and if the average attendance must be the basis, then, as I have said before, where the attendance is diminished through no fault of the teacher certainly some pressure should be brought to bear on the authorities to get him transferred to another school where he will get a fair salary. That is one reason why I should like to see a colonial scale of staff and salaries. A man would have a greater chance of promotion than is the case now, when the Legislature has tied the hands of Boards by vague instructions about consulting Committees. I could tell you of teachers here who, the attendance having gone down through no fault of their own, causing them to be in danger of losing salary, have over and over again applied for transfer, sending in applications for schools in other parts of the district; but because these men have done eight or ten years' good service for the Board it was considered a good reason by the local Committees for passing them over and getting outsiders. Should not length of service also be taken into account in fixing salaries? Should you not reward a man for faithful service? A schoolmaster has no such inducement; he may serve for twenty or thirty years, as the case may be, and then, grown old, he is liable to be cast aside as worn out. Another matter I do not like in the proposed scale is this: I do not see why it should

be stipulated that certain certificates are necessary for certain positions. Let a man prove his competency, and then let him have any position for which he is suitable. His certificate is only, at best, an imperfect gauge of such competency. A man may have a very high certificate and yet not be as competent as a man with a lower one. As cases in point, I have known university graduates in honours in New Zealand entitled to A certificates who have been quite unable to solve some easy little questions in arithmetic. Under the suggested scale we are told that none but a B1—*i.e.*, a graduate—is really eligible for a school of over 600, and that if a teacher does not possess this qualification he will be penalised. There are Inspectors of Schools who have no degrees; men whose efficiency is recognised, who are deemed competent to go into a school, pass an opinion upon the way it is organized, taught, and managed, advise the head-teacher how to work it, and yet, though they may even have no certificates at all, you demand a university degree from the teacher himself. There is a district in which four Inspectors are employed, only one of whom has a degree, and I venture to say that very few who know them would assert that the graduate was the best Inspector. I am not arguing against degrees, I simply say they are not the gauge of efficiency that this proposed scale implies, and I contend that you should not penalise a man for what, after all, may be only want of opportunity. There are very many well-read men who have not had the opportunity of going to college and obtaining a degree for the simple reason that they were unable to afford it. A bonus system would be better than the reduction proposed in the case of certificates—give an incentive to a man to steadily pursue professional study by offering £5 a year more if he will work up for a D, another £5 if he obtains a C, and so on. Our system of classification of certificates is altogether too cumbrous. A School Committee hereabout appointed a candidate with a D3 when there were others with a D1, on the grounds that a D3 must be better than a D1. Committees do not understand the relative values of certificates. In regard to classification, there are three divisions and three subdivisions of each in the English system, and these are sufficient. A teacher who holds an English certificate of "The First Division of the First Degree of Merit" can get no higher, and it often takes a man fifteen years after he leaves college to mount to that degree. If such a man is capable of taking charge of any English school, I have not yet seen the colonial school that he was not fit to take charge of. Yet he might have only a D or a C classification here. A C1 certificate would be quite high enough for any of our elementary-school purposes; there is the same routine in the teaching in larger as in smaller schools, and it is very much of the same character. Because a man has taken a degree that does not guarantee his efficiency. An Oxford B.A. who came to me to be taught school management and the art of teaching possessed as little natural aptitude for teaching as any one I ever met. Can a teacher do his work? That is the test. If a man does his work efficiently that should be sufficient; he is duly qualified, no matter what his certificate may be. Certainly I would ask of you to throw open to men with low classifications greater opportunities of getting those higher certificates. I know teachers who have prepared year after year to take their degree, but have been unable to do so on account of inability to leave their school just before examination; perhaps on account of the high fees and the other expenses attaching to it. With regard to the general scale of payment under the proposed scale, though I do not admit it is in any way perfect, it will be an improvement on the scale at present prevailing here. With regard to the difference of salaries in the sexes, I believe Mr. Hogben is in favour of making salaries uniform up to a living-wage, and he has put down £80 as the minimum. Would it not be possible to raise that living-wage a little higher? It might very well be brought up to £120. The living-wage as fixed is too low. Of course, it would mean a great deal more expense, but, still, I think it should be done, and the report you draw up might contain that suggestion.

278. *Mr. Hill.*] Does the possession of a high certificate necessarily mean an efficient teacher?—No. Were I asked to suggest a test I might adopt a remark in one of your own reports: "He is a good teacher who can teach and train one fair-sized class well, he is a very good teacher who can teach and train two such classes well, he is an excellent teacher who can teach and train three such classes well, and the man is not born who can teach and train four such classes to the best advantage."

279. Do you not consider, other things being equal, that a man who has been teaching for, say, twenty years is worth more—as an educator and trainer of children, not as a crammer—than a young man of one or two years' experience only?—Yes; and I think it would be a good thing to give such a man some recognition of the fact that he is a thoroughly experienced teacher.

280. Do you not think that, if teachers were arranged into, say, three classes, class 3 to typify a teacher of below ten years' experience, and class 1 one to include those with an experience of twenty years, so as to show at once an experienced teacher—would you not approve of that?—Yes, so far as it goes; but it would not testify to a teacher's literary abilities.

281. Would you place academic status before special training?—No; I know of teachers in this district, D1 men, who, I believe, could hold their own professionally against almost any two teachers you could find.

282. Are you aware what subjects are essential in the primary schools?—I think that the concern of the Education Department is simply to issue certificates of efficiency for the work of the elementary schools. Of course, a man may be a very admirable teacher of an elementary school and yet not be able to pass an advanced examination in Latin or higher mathematics.

283. Is there anything in the arts course that is essential to, or highly desirable in, an elementary teacher?—Not unless he takes science as one of the subjects for his degree. Some of our young people would have liked to take science, but could not, because they had not attended classes at an affiliated institution.

284. Do you not think it would be better, for example, that the Government should establish a teacher's degree of equal difficulty with the arts degree at the present time? A university man can come down and become a teacher, whilst at the present time the teacher has to go through a

long training before he can get the academic degree: do you not think that advisable?—Yes, I am in favour of the Government doing that. Personally, other things being fairly equal, I should prefer a man with good university training, regarding his degree less as actual evidence of attainment than of culture. I am strongly of opinion that there should be a series of examinations—a graduated series of examinations—and suggested to the late Inspector-General many years ago that he should provide a higher and more comprehensive examination in school management, something on the lines of that of the College of Preceptors.

285. With regard to my question as to the Government establishing a teacher's degree, do you think that it would be beneficial to the profession?—Yes.

286. *Mr. Stewart.*] You quoted figures as to the fluctuation in attendance, and on some days you said your attendance was between 40 and 50: would those days be counted in the working average?—No.

287. Does the concession made by the department of not counting in half-days when the attendance is below half the number give any real benefit to the country schools?—No; it does not go far enough.

288. You think the number present when the attendance is to be counted should be more than one-half the number on the school-roll?—Yes.

289. Is this not a specially important point in view of the fact that we propose to regulate staff and salaries by average attendance?—Yes.

290. You do not propose to commit yourself to the statement that you would classify the teachers on mere length of service?—No; I advocate something approaching the English system of three grades, and three divisions in each grade.

291. As a matter of fact, in the elementary-school teacher which is the more desirable, the man who has passed through an academic course in six subjects, or a man who has devoted his time to wide general reading?—The man who has devoted his time to wide general reading.

292. Why?—A man may get his degree from a simple knowledge of a few books. He has not the knowledge that is gathered from a wide general reading, and may be quite lacking in other equally important qualifications as a teacher. He is what I should call a narrower man than the other.

293. Have you had any experience of a school of about 40 children?—Yes.

294. What was the staffing?—Myself and a sewing-mistress; the sewing-mistress came two afternoons a week for two hours.

295. How many standards had you in that school?—I had all the standards; it was under the English code.

296. What would you consider a liberally staffed school of from 35 to 40?—A master and an assistant.

297. Would you be in favour of pupil-teachers or an assistant?—I am strongly in favour of the adult labour over the pupil-teacher labour. It saves the headmaster a great deal of anxiety. Although pupil-teachers may be well trained in the course of a year or two, no one would like to say how many characters he spoils in acquiring the art of forming character.

298. In the proposed scale where there is an attendance of 35 the fixed salary is placed at £150 for the head-teacher, and £80 for the assistant-teacher: which would have the best effect in inducing persons to enter the profession, to pay a pupil-teacher £40, and the headmaster £190 in the one case, or as it is at present?—It would be better to keep it as it is.

299. The chief complaint you make in regard to this proposed scale is that the payment of salaries is based on average attendance?—Yes.

300. The next complaint you have is the penalty for the lower certificate?—Yes.

301. So that in other respects you think it is a very fair scale?—Yes; but I think the country should be prepared to do full justice to the teachers, even at a cost beyond what the scale contemplates.

302. With regard to the question of residences, do you think it would be possible to draw up an equitable scale without reference to whether a school had a residence or not?—In some places I do not know what teachers would do if there were no residences attached to the schools.

303. Suppose a case occurred where two teachers were enjoying the same salary, while one had a house in addition and the other had not: do you think we could ignore that?—No.

304. You think we must deal with the question of house allowance when we deal with the question of salaries?—Yes, I think so; I consider my house as part of my salary.

305. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You consider that the country should do justice to the teachers in the payment of salaries?—Yes.

306. Is it not a fact that the teachers in some districts are required to teach more children per head than in others?—Yes.

307. How many pupils do you consider could be taught efficiently in a small school by one teacher?—Not more than thirty.

308. In some schools at the present time they can teach 40 and 45 before getting a pupil-teacher?—Yes; but I think that number too high.

309. Is not the work done efficiently?—Yes, fairly so, I presume; but I think it could be done more efficiently with a less number.

310. *Mr. Davidson.*] A master in charge of a school between 30 and 40 gets the assistance of a sewing-mistress; between 45 and 50, a monitor; so that practically there are three teachers in schools of from 45 to 50, are there not?—I consider a monitor an excrescence on the staff. One good assistant would be better than the sewing-mistress and the monitor.

311. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] In Otago and Southland a teacher has to conduct the school alone until the attendance goes up to 45 in average attendance: do you consider that 45 would be too many under the charge of a sole teacher?—I think 30 are quite as many as he can properly exercise control over and give due individual care to in the moulding of character.

312. Do you not think that the majority of teachers would prefer to teach up to 40 or 45 as long as they got the increased salary?—Personally, I should prefer help. It would depend on the number of standards. A teacher could teach 50 or 100 or more if in one standard, but he could not train them as they should be trained.

313. Do you think we should differentiate between the work expected from a country school and that required in a town school?—Yes; the same demands should not be made upon a country school as upon a town school.

314. Do you not consider that Education Boards as a rule are rather parochial in the matter of appointing teachers—that they do not like to appoint teachers from outside districts to the better class of schools in their own districts?—The Marlborough Board could not be accused of any want of liberality in that direction.

315. Does your Board encourage the transfer of teachers from one district to another?—I believe it claims the right, but has never exercised it.

316. Do you consider that Inspectors should be centralised?—I do.

317. You know some of the circumstances in connection with these aided schools in the Sounds: is it not a fact that in some cases teachers have advertised in newspapers that they would take in boarders as pupils?—I only know of one school that did so—that at Robin Hood Bay. An advertisement appeared in a Wellington paper.

318. How long ago was that?—Last year, I think. I believe there are boarders from Otago, Wellington, and Nelson.

319. *Mr. Hill.*] Is it a private school?—It is on the Board's list of schools.

320. In this district?—Yes.

321. They guarantee free instruction?—Yes.

322. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are any of the members of the household pupils in that school?—I could not tell you.

Mr. Smith (Inspector): At the present time there are not.

323. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] What was the tenor of the advertisement?—That I am unable to say exactly. I remember seeing the advertisement in a Wellington paper calling attention to the site of the school, its healthy situation, and the medals and scholarships that the children had gained.

324. Had the headmaster a library as an inducement?—I do not know. I am sure he is an educated man, and two young friends who spent a holiday there mentioned how extremely pleasant everything was.

325. Do you not think that if other Education Boards were as liberal in the establishment of these aided schools it would be a great drain on their finances?—It might be so. When the Board first established that particular school it had not assumed its present phase. I am sure, however, that aided and household schools are a necessity here; people go out and carve homes for themselves, pay rates and taxes, and surely their children are entitled to the benefits of education?

326. *Mr. Davidson.*] I understand you to say that you object to the intermediate capitation between the grades in this suggested scale?—Yes. I think that the schools should be divided into so many classes, and that the salaries should be fixed.

327. You perhaps remember, in looking over the suggested scale, that one of the grades of schools is from 19 to 35?—Yes.

328. The suggested salary is £118?—Yes.

329. That is to say, the salary ranges from £118 to £150. Would you prefer having the schools graded in this way—say, three grades with a fixed salary for each, instead of starting at a fixed salary of £118?—I should be afraid of making too many classes of schools.

330. You might have the schools classified into five or six classes so as to make the differences as small as possible: would you prefer that to the capitation grant?—Yes.

331. If you look at the suggested scale from 35 to 75, the salary is £150, with a capitation grant of 12s. for each additional pupil up to £174: is that not so?—Yes.

332. Instead of having that grade 35 to 75, would you prefer having it, say, 36 to 40 or 46 to 50?—I should prefer having it broken up; I think 35 to 75 too big a jump.

333. You would prefer to see a scale graded in that way with fixed salaries for each grade?—Yes; to avoid risks of deductions through lowering attendance.

334. You object to the minimum certificate required for each class of schools?—Yes. I think C1 should be good enough for anything in elementary work.

335. Would you approve in the classification of schools of the highest minimum being C1?—I do not know that I should fix a certificate at all, for I feel that, after all, the certificate is not really a test. If a man could give evidence in other ways that he had really done good work I should be prepared to take him. I think a C1 man who can manage a school of 500 or 600 could manage a school of 1,600.

336. *Mr. Hogben.*] You have laid a great deal of emphasis on the fact of basing the scale on average attendance: you do not believe in that?—No.

337. Is not the scale based on average attendance if you divide it up into grades?—That is not exactly what I suggest.

338. You say that you want the schools classified?—Yes.

339. Then, it is a question of the basis of that classification?—Yes, exactly. I have advocated a roll-number basis.

340. Taking the question of classification, if we take salaries such as are proposed here, a male teacher's salary in a school of 25 is £130, is it not?—Yes.

341. If he has a school of 26 he receives a salary of £132, so that it makes a difference of £2 to him if his school rises or falls by one?—Yes. I was merely discussing it generally, and contending that it would be better to divide the schools into certain classes and fix the salaries. I

should be prepared as a teacher, if I accepted a school of the second grade, to accept the salary fixed for that grade whatever the attendance in the grade was.

342. Do you not think that a man's salary should rise £2 for every unit?—Yes; the principle of increase for numbers is all right; but I would make about eight classes of schools. As I said before, I think 35 to 75 too big a jump altogether.

343. Do you think it better to have a sudden jump of £10 from a school of 25 to 26, £10 in some cases, and nothing at all in others, or do you think it better to rise £2 at a time for every unit?—I object to a man's salary being fixed on average attendance at all, but would rather forego the possibility of increase to obviate the unpleasant possibility of decrease.

344. Do you not think it would be very dangerous to pay on the roll-number?—I do not think so; the roll has to be purged.

345. As a matter of fact, is the roll purged?—In our district it is and would be. It would depend on the Inspector. Our Inspector looks closely into registration details. The roll-number could be more easily checked than the average attendance.

346. Speaking generally, as a matter of fact, is it your opinion that rolls are kept purged throughout the colony?—I can only speak with regard to schools I know of; I am of opinion that they are.

347. You stated that the School Attendance Act of 1894 has been the means of encouraging bad attendance?—Yes.

348. Then, how do you account for the rising in attendance throughout the colony after the passing of the Act?—I do not know that it is so. I know that parents in this district have taken advantage of the Act, who previously sent their children regularly to school.

349. However, you think that the Act encourages bad attendance?—Yes, I do.

350. Then, would you not expect to find that the attendance had fallen throughout the colony?—Yes, one would expect so.

351. Then, on the whole, you would not say that the Act had encouraged bad attendance?—I think it has been ineffective here in improving the attendance.

352. You spoke of it being a teacher's duty to simply teach, and not to look up pupils, or anything of that kind?—Yes, I did.

353. Do you think it is fair, on moral grounds, or on other grounds, that a teacher's duties should be strictly limited to twenty-five hours a week?—Yes, I think so—the duties he is engaged to discharge. I think it is the business of the parents to send the children.

354. Then, you do take the higher ground in looking at the question?—I do not think it is the teacher's business; if he takes an interest in his children he will, of course, naturally endeavour to get them to attend regularly for their own sakes, and has already quite enough inducements to do so, when you consider that his reputation as a teacher may be involved in it.

355. Then, taking the higher ground, a teacher should do something to see that the children do attend?—Yes, I suppose so.

356. On the question of certificates, you are aware that the certificates depend on three elements: literary attainment, length of service, and the marks for efficiency?—Yes.

357. You are also aware that the marks for efficiency are given by the Inspectors of Schools?—Yes.

358. You are aware that there are marks for length of service?—Yes.

359. And those together give the means of arriving at the figures?—Yes.

360. Did you notice that four times as much was deducted for the figure as for the letter?—No, I do not think I did.

361. Then, your remarks were made with the idea that more weight was given to the literary attainment?—No; I was speaking of Committees. Committees attach more importance to it. I am strongly in favour of the English classification system.

362. You do not consider it a disadvantage to a teacher to have a degree, I suppose?—No; but I think he has at present an unfair double pull over the man who has not.

363. You have considered the question of staffing?—Yes.

364. You have considered it from the point of view of not merely instructing children in order to pass certain standards, but with a view to the training of their powers?—Yes.

365. Do you consider it the more important view to look to the training of their powers?—Yes, I do.

366. At what stage would you give a master some assistance if you were drawing up this scale?—After thirty in average attendance, as soon as possible.

367. You would prefer that the assistance should take the form of a certificated teacher and not of a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

368. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] By what process would you suggest that promotions should be made, and what authorities should make those promotions?—I think that Boards should distinctly understand and should exercise their right of transferring teachers from one part of their district to another, and promote deserving men from lower schools to higher. In some districts it is done; the Wellington Board often transfers. In the case of the Marlborough Board nothing of that sort is considered; all places are thrown open to public competition.

369. You think that the Boards should promote without consultation with the Committees?—Yes, I think so.

370. In alluding to one of these homestead schools, Robin Hood Bay, you stated that it was a great strain on the finances of the Board, did you not?—No; I said it might be so in regard to aided schools generally, not in regard to Robin Hood Bay.

371. How could an aided school like Robin Hood, with twelve children, be a great strain on the finances of the Board?—I do not know that schools of that size are, but many have only an attendance of two or three.

372. Say you had one school with an average of 25 pupils, and this Board were to appoint the teacher and also give its Committee an allowance of 8s., would that not come to more than the cost of five aided schools?—Yes, I think it would.

373. Alluding once more to the Robin Hood Bay, assuming it had 25 pupils, and was conducted as now, the Board's allowance to that school would be, according to Regulation 40, £82 10s.; the Marlborough Education Board would receive for that school from the Government £93 15s. The Robin Hood Bay School would, of course, receive an extra £10, so that it would show a profit and not a loss to the Board of over £20: is that not so?—Yes, I think so.

374. Do you think that parents should always be expected to send their children to local schools and to no other when questions of ill-health or other causes should render it advisable to select seaside schools?—I believe that it is a good school for the children to go to. My contention is that it is not a public school as contemplated by the Act, but that it is, practically, turned into a private Board school.

375. But would it not be an advantage to the Board, instead of having five separate schools, each with an attendance of about 5, as you said, to have all the children boarded in one school if parents are willing to pay the cost of boarding the children in one school?—It would still not meet my objection that it is not a public school as contemplated by the Act.

376. But would it not be an advantage if, instead of having five separate schools, you had them all boarded in one school?—It would be an advantage if it could be done, but I do not think it could be done.

377. *The Chairman.*] If you were a teacher in charge of one of these small schools would you consider that your work was more laborious if you had 25 children instead of 15?—It would be practically the same.

378. Then, if you had 25 and the number dwindled down to 20, 15, or 10 you would not consider your work very much diminished?—No.

379. Do you think it fair that a teacher in charge of a school of from 15 to 20 should have fluctuations in his salary because a family of four or five happened to move in or out of the district?—No, I do not think any teacher's salary should suffer from such a cause.

380. Under this scale we have a teacher in charge of 15 children receiving £75 a year, and if a family moves in or out of the neighbourhood he is subject to a rise or else penalised, as the case may be. Do you disapprove of a scheme under which a teacher's salary may be increased or lowered according to the increase or reduction by units?—Yes.

381. Do you think that there should be an age-limit in regard to pupil-teachers?—Yes, I think so; I think 15 is a very good limit. If they go on then with the four years' training for a pupil-teachership they are more easily trained than if they left school for a few years and came back at eighteen or nineteen years of age.

382. I notice under your regulations that you have a system of admitting candidates for pupil-teachers for six months on probation, during which they receive no pay?—That is so; and there is no difficulty in actual practice. I could get any number of girls to continue on those terms for two or three years, and by the time they became pupil-teachers they are well advanced with their work.

383. What is the general length of the preparatory term before they are appointed pupil-teachers?—It depends on the number of pupil-teachers, and the number of vacancies.

384. There is not much chance of the newly appointed pupil-teacher breaking down under the strain of having to perform the daily school-work and afterwards prepare for a tolerably severe examination?—No. Under our system their work is prepared for; they have been going on with it for some time before they become pupil-teachers, and usually get their certificates, either E or D, before the expiry of their term of service.

385. You have not known of boys or girls breaking down under the strain?—No, I have not.

386. Under the proposed scale the headmaster of a school of 420 pupils receives a salary of £301, does he not?—Yes.

387. If in charge of a school of 1,000 pupils he receives £388, a difference of £87, does he not?—Yes, that is so.

388. Do you think that the work of the headmaster in charge of a school with 1,000 pupils is very much more severe, or that he requires to be a much more highly qualified man than the headmaster in charge of a school of 420 pupils?—I do not think so. I do not think his work is materially increased by doubling the numbers. He has a large staff of assistants and pupil-teachers. In this colony I had a school of 900, and had to go into twenty-two rooms to see what was going on, but my work was no harder than it is in Picton.

389. You think a maximum salary might be fixed for teachers of, say, over 500?—Yes.

390. In that case, how would it affect Marlborough? Do you not think that the teachers would be attracted to the larger centres?—They would not come into this district.

391. You mean that a teacher of superior qualifications in this district would endeavour to get to Wellington, Christchurch, or Dunedin?—Yes.

392. Then, if a fixed salary were made applicable to schools of 500 and upwards, you think it would tend to impoverish the smaller districts like Marlborough?—Yes, I think that would be the natural tendency.

393. With regard to the question of a minimum salary, do you think £80 is sufficient for a competent man? Take the case of a teacher in one of our back-block schools, where a man has to lodge with some of the settlers at a cost of from 15s. to £1 per week, and has to clothe himself, buy books, and so on: is it possible for him to do that on £80 a year?—No, he cannot do it.

394. Then, what do you think would be an adequate salary?—I do not see how he could get on under £90 a year at least. If he is studious he will want books, &c., and to pass college examinations he has to pay fees, and he will not have much left after these expenses are met.

DAVID ANDERSON STURROCK, Headmaster of the Blenheim School, examined.

Mr. Sturrock: There is one matter I would like to call attention to, and that is in regard to the attendance. The point I wish to bring out is the difficulty as to the roll-number and the purging of rolls. In Great Britain no teacher would think of doing that. If he did so it meant having his name placed in the blue-book and part of the Government grant forfeited. With regard to pupil-teachers, the boys will not come forward as the salary is not sufficient. For the whole of the District of Marlborough, I think, you will only find at the outside six male pupil-teachers extending back twenty or thirty years. An anomaly that exists is in regard to salaries. I was second master in the Napier School for a number of years at a salary of £360 a year, while first assistant masters in Wellington were receiving only £220. I brought that matter up at the Institute in Napier, pointing out how unfair it was, and I said I was willing to lose part of my salary if I benefited the teachers as a body. I agree with the system in the proposed scale of an advance step by step.

395. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you think that several departments tend to efficiency?—No.

396. Have you female pupil-teachers in your department?—Yes.

397. Do they put male teachers in the female department?—No.

398. Who trains the pupil-teachers?—I do with regard to my own school.

399. You receive payment?—Yes.

400. In reference to the instruction carried on in the several departments, you take your own pupil-teachers, and the mistress takes the female pupil-teachers in the girls' department?—Yes.

401. What is your opinion with regard to the centralisation of the inspectorate?—I believe in it.

402. In the case of men in small schools, do you think it would be beneficial to give a special grant on account of such pupils who had passed Standard VI.?—I do not think I would give a bonus when you have a colonial scale of staff and salaries.

403. If such is the case, then you think that the salary for a teacher in a school below 35 is ample?—No, I do not.

404. I thought you approved of the scale?—I believe, in the first instance, you should pay a man more than £80 a year.

405. What is your opinion as to the employment of a mistress instead of a master in such schools?—I think a female better.

406. Why?—She is better able to take the infants.

407. You think that in small subsidised schools, such as you have in this district, females are preferable to males?—In side-schools.

408. I mean the small aided schools, with an average of 3, 4, and 5 in attendance?—Yes, I think so.

409. Would you put a female in a school below 35 in preference to a male?—It depends on the certificate.

410. Never mind the certificate. Do you think it would be best to place a competent female, the best material you could get, in schools below 35 in preference to males?—It is a hard question to answer; I think I would put a male.

411. At what limit?—From 35 upwards.

412. Then, in schools with an average attendance below 35 you think it preferable to put a female?—I think so.

413. Do you think her moral influence in such a district would be better than that of a male?—I think it would be as good.

414. You would not say better?—I do not think so.

415. From 35 upwards you would place a male?—Yes.

416. Over 35 there must be an assistant: should that assistant be a male assistant?—Yes.

417. Then, you would staff a school of from 35 to 75 with a headmistress and a male assistant?—Yes; you would need to do that.

418. Do you think the school would be efficiently worked under such conditions?—I am afraid it would not.

419. You say, supposing you had a growing school over 35, it would necessitate a rearrangement in the staff, and that the mistress would suffer in consequence, not from inefficiency, but because of the increase in attendance?—Yes.

420. It would necessitate a change of salary in her case by the very simple means of removal to another school, would it not?—Yes.

421. Would not this imply that in such a case a regulation would be necessary to the effect that a female who is in charge must be transferred?—Yes.

422. It would give the right of transference to the Education Boards, irrespective of School Committees?—Yes.

423. You think that would be a good plan?—Yes.

424. Is it more difficult to teach 26 children than 25?—I do not think so.

425. Do you think it more difficult to teach 51 than 50?—No.

426. Do you think it would be more difficult to control and organize a school of 250 than one of 150?—A little more, I should say.

427. Why? Are there not the same classes, the same standards?—Yes; but you have more teachers in the one case. I think it would be harder to control 150 than 250, because of the fewer teachers.

428. You think it requires greater skill and organizing capacity?—Yes.

429. In schools of 300 and 400 do you think it requires greater organizing capacity in one of 400 than one of 300?—No, I do not think so.

430. Take 450 and 550: does it require greater organizing capacity in the case of the school of 550?—No.

431. Do you think that teachers who had charge of schools of from 300 to 400 should be placed generally on a fair basis for classification purposes?—Yes, I think so.

432. Do you think that there should be a distinction in salary on account of experience?—Yes, I do.

433. You think a system like that would be a fair one?—I think so.

434. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you prefer, as in the suggested scale, the rise by units—that is, that there should be a capitation grant for every one above a given number—or that there should be bigger gaps between the rises?—I prefer it as set out in the suggested scale.

435. In that you differ from Mr. Howard?—Yes.

436. Do you really think it requires less organizing skill on the part of a teacher to organize a school of 300 than a school of 150?—Yes, I think so. In a school of 250 you have probably several rooms in which you can place your staff to advantage; while in the case of 150 there would only be two rooms, and consequently less space to work in.

437. Then, practically, the question comes down to suitability of buildings?—There is a great deal in that.

438. There would be more teachers in a school of 300 than in a school of 150?—Yes.

439. Would not the headmaster have to discriminate between the applicants?—Yes.

440. Then, in a school of 300 the responsibility of the head-teacher would be greater?—Yes.

441. As the number of pupils increase you consider that the responsibility of the head-teacher is increased?—Yes.

442. Do you think the responsibility and the need for organizing-power increase side by side? Would it not mean greater power of classification and organization? Would it not imply that there must be increased power on the part of the master dealing with numbers?—Yes, I think so.

443. Is it not a fact that a master may succeed in the conduct of teachers in schools of 200 and 250 but would break down in higher numbers?—Yes.

444. You think it advisable that he should pass through grades of schools?—Yes.

445. Then, if he should pass through grades of schools, how do you reconcile the statement that it is comparatively easy to organize a school of 250 compared with a school of 150?—In a school of 300, 400, or 500 the headmaster would not have so much work to do in teaching; his work would consist of supervising, principally.

446. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You stated that in schools up to a certain limit a female was to be preferred to a male?—Yes, in small schools.

447. It would depend on the locality and the circumstances surrounding it, would it not?—Exactly; you cannot make a hard-and-fast rule upon it.

448. You have experienced considerable difficulty in the Marlborough District in obtaining male pupil-teachers?—We cannot get them.

449. For what reason?—The salaries paid are too small. A boy commencing in an office would get about £40, while as a pupil-teacher he would only receive £20.

450. How do you account for the fact that a large number of females offer themselves for positions in the teaching profession?—I suppose they consider it is a nice profession to belong to.

451. There are not so many avenues open to them?—No.

452. Do you think if the Boards increased the salaries males would then offer their services?—Yes.

453. Are you satisfied with the system of staffing as adopted by the Marlborough Education Board?—No, I am not.

454. Do you consider that a teacher has too much to do in comparison with the salary paid him?—Yes.

455. Have you had experience in a school in Marlborough ranging from 30 to 54?—No.

456. Can you inform me how these schools are worked with a headmaster and mistress?—I do not know.

457. Among your regulations there is one as to the responsibility of the headmaster: is that rule found rather irksome?—Yes.

458. Do the School Committees in Marlborough interfere with the organization and discipline of classes?—They try to.

459. On the whole, you consider that the proposed or suggested scale of staff and salaries would be more or less satisfactory?—It would be.

460. With certain slight alterations?—Yes.

461. Have you experienced any difficulty in this district with the teachers in regard to their examinations?—No.

462. Would it be better if the examinations were all conducted by the Education Department?—Yes, I think it would be.

463. Are you in favour of teachers obtaining Class D through the Matriculation Examination?—No.

464. *Mr. Luke.*] Your infant-schools are mixed schools?—Yes.

465. At what age do the children leave the infant-school?—At eight or nine years.

466. Then, your salary decreases?—Yes.

467. *Mr. Hogben.*] Would you put an assistant in a school first, or a pupil-teacher?—An assistant.

468. On what grounds?—If you put a pupil-teacher in a small school the chances are that the master or the mistress would not be thoroughly efficient to train the pupil-teachers; in a large school, of course, it would be different.

469. On that ground you object to having a pupil-teacher first?—Yes.

470. Approximately, what would be the average attendance when you think a master should have assistance?—Over 30.

471. *The Chairman.*] Through the school not being a mixed or combined one you suffer materially in your salary?—Yes; at the end of the year I have to send up all my First Standard girls, and I loss them in my average.

G. WILMOTT, Headmaster of Waiotahi School, examined.

Mr. Wilmot: I do not know that I have very much to add to the evidence that has already been tendered. Although I highly appreciate the scale that is suggested, I never have agreed with, nor can I agree with, the increases by one. From 1868 to 1877 in Victoria we had similar increases by one, and they were perfect nuisances. In 1877 it was altered, and we were paid by fixed salary and a bonus on passes. In 1888 they established in New South Wales a classification of schools into ten classes, and I have never met any scale so easily worked as that of New South Wales. The lowest salary was £108 and the highest £400. From 20 to 30, the salary would be £132; from 40 to 50, £180; 100 to 200, £228; and so on. The work is the same, but the system of payment very much easier. I think that in the payment by jumps of one there will be a feeling of dishonesty. I have been teaching for forty-seven years, and I think that there would be that feeling, that suggestion about it, and consequently I think it would be far better to classify the schools into classes—six or eight classes—and pay according to those classes. In looking over the suggested scheme, it is apparent to me that the schools from 19 to 35 and thence up to 75 will claim the great majority of teachers, and these want a higher salary in proportion than the teachers in town schools, for the country teachers have more expenses to meet. Take a man with a family in charge of a school of 34: nominally he has a salary of £148 put down to him, and if he has to pay £10 to a sewing-mistress it leaves him only £138. Of course, it states if he be married his wife may have preference, but if he is a single man there is the important point of £10 being taken from him.

472. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] What is the average attendance at your school at the present time?—It is very low now; ten years ago it was up to 100, now it is exactly 38.

473. What salary do you receive?—Thanks to the kindness of the Board, they have never interfered with the salary they gave me ten years ago—namely, £175.

474. Then, you are not paid according to your scale?—No; I was here before that scale was drawn up.

475. The proposed scale will not mean any advance to you?—No, it will not.

476. You say that, in your opinion, the increased payment by capitation on each one will not work satisfactorily?—No; it would be a perfect nuisance.

477. That has been your experience?—Yes.

478. Do you consider that the present scale of staff and salary adopted by the Marlborough Board is satisfactory?—No, I do not. A man has to teach a school up to 54 unaided.

479. What do you consider the maximum number that a teacher can take, or should be allowed to teach, in a small country school?—I should say, up to 32.

480. Would you give a pupil-teacher after that?—No.

481. What form would the assistance take?—An assistant.

482. You stated that the teachers in country schools should be paid a comparatively higher salary than teachers doing the same class of work in town schools: are you aware that they get house allowance?—Yes; in some cases they do, not in all.

483. If they have not a residence they get the allowance?—Yes.

484. Do you consider that in the larger centres like Wellington first assistants should get house allowance?—No. In a school of 900 the headmaster has a vast amount of responsibility, and the first assistant comparatively little; he has perhaps three or four classes, but you cannot pay the headmaster too highly.

485. Is it not a fact that the Fifth and Sixth Standards are taught by the first assistant, and not by the headmaster?—Only in cases where the school reaches 900. I was once in charge of a school of 900, and I found that my whole time was taken up in showing the junior teachers how to do their work.

486. *Mr. Davidson.*] One of your strongest objections to this suggested scale is the fact that in case of a mistress being at the head of a school of 75 she would have a male as her assistant, a pupil-teacher who had served four years, and probably been one or two years in a training-college, and that, whereas her salary might increase from £134 to £146, the salary of the assistant would only increase to £90?—Yes.

487. *Mr. Hogben.*] You prefer the system of going by grades instead of units?—Yes.

488. On the grounds of a feeling of dishonesty?—Yes.

489. Of course, teachers like to be free not only from the temptation, but from the suspicion of it?—Yes, of course.

490. Do you think that there would be less temptation if you went from the small jump of salary for every increase of one in average attendance than if you went in big jumps—instead of making, say, ten small temptations, would you not make one big one?—Yes.

491. Then, do you not think that a great number of teachers, young men and women whose moral character is still in the course of formation, would find a greater temptation if, instead of an increase of 3s. 4d. a month, they would get three or five times that by a big jump?—The second temptation would only happen once in ten.

492. Then, you think it preferable to have a big jump in salary than a gradual increase per unit?—Yes, I do.

493. Do you not think that the difficulty would be overcome by making your average reckoning or average salary for a longer period of time, such as two years, instead of on one quarter?—Yes.

494. *The Chairman.*] In the case of your own school, where the average attendance has dwindled, is it due to children leaving the district, and growing up, and so on?—Yes.

495. With regard to what you state as an objection owing to temptation, it is not so much the temptation offered by the increase as the crushing effect on a teacher of a decrease for which he is in no way responsible?—Yes, I object to that.

496. What assistance have you?—I am one of those who have a sewing-mistress at £12 a year.

497. What does the Committee receive?—7s. 6d. per head.

498. During the time you have been in charge of this school have you applied for the charge of some larger schools?—Yes, over and over again. I might instance the case of the late Mr. Lucas. He came here twenty years ago, and remained here teaching until his health began to fail. He applied for schools here, there, and everywhere to my knowledge, but they would not have him, and although he had splendid testimonials he could not get away from here.

499. Was that the fault of the Education Board or the School Committee?—The Education Board; they will not send the names up.

500. *Mr. Hill.*] It was not the fault of your Education Board?—Not our Education Board; the Boards he applied to.

501. You prefer that teachers should be transferred to other districts by the Education Department?—Yes.

NATHANIEL THOMAS PRICHARD, Chairman of the Grovetown School Committee, examined.

502. *The Chairman.*] How long have you acted in your capacity?—Nearly thirty years.

503. We shall be very pleased to hear from you with regard to the subject under discussion?—Well, I only wish to say that we are perfectly satisfied with our teachers; and with regard to the question of the amalgamation of the sexes, I quite approve of it. The grievance of the assistant teachers in this district is that they stand no chance of rising in the profession.

504. How do you get on with your pupil-teachers?—Very well. The only trouble we had was some years ago; we had a teacher who was intemperate, and the Board would not take action.

505. Was the Committee prepared to take action: did they make a complaint?—Yes; I went to the Board myself.

506. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Did the Committee recommend his dismissal?—Yes; but it took three years to get rid of him.

507. *The Chairman.*] What effect had it on the school: did the attendance suffer?—Yes, very materially; the average attendance was 56, and when he left 25. I think the Board should take more notice of complaints brought forward by the Committee against teachers.

508. Generally speaking, the teaching has been satisfactory?—Yes.

509. There has only been that one complaint?—Yes.

510. You are satisfied with your present staff?—Yes; and we work very amicably together.

511. Have you a teacher's residence?—Yes; but the house is very rotten. It has been up thirty-five years, I should say. The reason the school was established at Grovetown in the first place was on account of the country between Blenheim and Grovetown being flooded, and the children were unable to get into Blenheim.

512. In regard to the interior of the building, is it well lighted and entirely suitable for the children?—Not the central part of it. That was the first part built. As the school increased we added to the building.

513. Then, the old portion is very defective?—Yes.

514. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You say there is a teacher's residence: has the teacher a family who require the whole of the house?—Yes. First of all, there were three rooms, and they were added to gradually, and the building has been patched up.

515. The question has been raised whether it would be wise to allow part of the allowance to go for rental instead of building-allowance?—We could not get a suitable house in the district.

516. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] What is the average attendance at your school?—96 to 114; for the last quarter 97.

517. I see some time ago that the average attendance was 106: it has since gone down?—Yes.

518. Under the proposed scale the female assistant would receive £10 a year more than at present?—Yes.

519. If the average went above the hundred there would be another assistant—a male—so that the proposed scale would be a decided advantage on the scale you have at present in regard to staffing and salaries, would it not?—Yes.

NELSON.

TUESDAY, 30TH APRIL, 1901.

F. G. GIBBS, Headmaster of Boys' Central School, and President of Nelson Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Gibbs: The teachers of the district held a meeting on Saturday night under the auspices of the local Educational Institute. Mr. Easton and myself were deputed to lay before you the matters which we considered should be brought under your notice. I hand in a copy of the recommendations adopted by the meeting [Exhibit 16]. I will deal first with clause 1 [clause read]. Of course, we do not wish this recommendation to be carried out with any great nicety.

But there are some portions of the colony—for instance, the back country of Nelson, the West Coast, and a few places in the interior of Otago—where the cost of living is shown by the Government returns to be double, or more than double, what it is in the large centres. The artisans in these districts are paid more in consequence, and we thought that some arrangement could be made, in a rough and ready way perhaps, to place the teachers in these districts on an equal footing with those in more favoured districts. The banks used to give their clerks on the west coast of this Island an extra allowance, and I believe some of them still do so. We should like to bring this principle under your notice. Mr. Easton has agreed to take charge of clauses 2 and 3. Coming to clause 4 [clause read], that recommendation was framed to meet such a case as that of Mr. Cowles, whose letter you have received this morning. There are a few other similar cases in this district. A few years ago some of the Nelson schools were amalgamated, and central boys' and girls' schools were established. Some of the teachers who had previously been teachers in the smaller schools were put into various positions in the central schools, and their salaries were kept at the previous figures. This is the reason why some of the salaries appear to be high. Whenever the Nelson Board has altered its scale it has acted in accordance with this principle, and we venture to express a wish that the Government will do the same in introducing its proposed scale. In the Nelson District there are some aided schools where the attendance falls very low, and in some cases the payment received by certificated teachers in charge has been not more than £2 or £2 10s. for the month. We think that the principle of a minimum living-wage should be adopted, and it should be understood that no certificated teacher should be allowed to take up work at such an exceedingly low remuneration.

1. *Mr. Hogben.*] Is that at the Tophouse?—No. It was at Pigeon Valley. Miss Cowles was the teacher. When the householders in some remote district request the Board to establish an aided school, some minimum salary should be fixed; and if the capitation under the new scale does not amount to £70 a year the householders should be required to make it up to that minimum. Clause 6 [read]: At the side-schools in Nelson the attendance ranges from 90 to about 170. The following are the returns of attendance at all the Nelson town schools for the September quarter of 1900: Tasman Street, 126; Hampden Street, 92; Brook Street, 68; Haven Road, 166; Toitoi Valley, 225; Boys' Central, 283. I would point out that the Board does not place the side-schools on the same footing as country complete schools. In some of the country schools with an attendance of from 20 to 25 the scale salary is £100. In the four side-schools referred to the minimum is £72, and the maximum is £84. We did not presume to decide whether a school in which children are taught only to the Second Standard should be ranked equal to a complete school of similar size or to a complete school of half or quarter of that size. We merely wish to bring before the Commission the fact that here is a state of things which seems to demand some special provision. In the Boys' and Girls' Central Schools, the upper standards only being taught, the teaching requirements are, presumably, higher than in complete schools with the same attendance, and the salaries are rather higher than they would be under the scale otherwise. We think that some special provision should be made in such cases as these. I am referring now to the proposed new scale. It seems to us that where higher requirements are demanded the salaries should be higher.

2. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your experience as a teacher: what class of schools have you taught in?—I was for about ten months assistant in the Bridge Street School in Nelson. At Westport I acted as temporary headmaster in the State school for three or four months.

3. What was the size of the Westport School?—The attendance was about 250.

4. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Was it the high school?—No; the high school was not then established. I was at the Nelson Boys' College as assistant master for four years and a half.

5. *Mr. Davidson.*] You have not taught in any small mixed country schools?—No.

6. Then, you cannot say from your own personal experience what number of pupils you think a sole teacher could efficiently manage, could you?—Not from experience.

7. I understand the schools in Nelson are separate schools, six in number?—Yes.

8. Do you think that those schools could with advantage be amalgamated?—Yes, with very great advantage, and with a great increase of efficiency so far as teaching is concerned.

9. And the same opinion would apply to the Richmond schools?—Yes.

10. Have you considered at any length the proposed scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

11. Have you noticed that the salary is arranged in two columns; in the first column the fixed salary is given, and between grades of schools there is an increase of capitation grant: do you think it better that there should be an increase by per unit or that a fixed salary for each grade of school should be given?—I think it better as laid down in the scale, by the increase per unit.

12. You notice that in the grade from 35 to 75 the head of the school and an assistant forms the staff?—Yes.

13. What is your opinion as to the liberality of that staffing: do you think an assistant should come in as early as 35?—Yes, I think so, seeing that the only alternative would be to have a pupil-teacher. Owing to disadvantages under which these pupil-teachers labour in small country schools, I think it would be better to bring in an assistant.

14. If it were possible to introduce a sewing-mistress as some form of assistance between 35 and 40, not to allow the introduction of a certificated teacher till after 40, and by that means give the teacher in the grade of from 35 to 40 a higher salary, would that in any way, or to any great extent, lessen the efficiency of the school?—There would be only five additional children, and for the five the headmaster, if a man were in charge, would have the assistance of a sewing-mistress, and an increased salary. I think that should work very well; but I am afraid it would be exceedingly difficult to get a good sewing-mistress in many of our back-country schools—I mean it would be difficult to find any one who would reach the departmental requirements.

15. Do you know that there is no such difficulty existing at the present time in any part of New Zealand?—I do not know whether there is or not.

16. Do you know the requirements of the department?—No.

17. Then, if you do not know the requirements you cannot say as to whether they are insisted upon?—Practically, I know of no special requirement that is insisted upon.

18. A sewing-mistress is only required to teach sewing, is she not?—Yes.

19. Are there any difficulties connected with this? Do you know of any difficulty in any part of New Zealand in getting sewing-mistresses?—No. I have not looked into the question.

20. What is the staffing allowed in Nelson in a school of from 50 to 100?—A school of 51 is allowed a teacher and a probationer, remaining at that until the school reaches 66, then one teacher and two probationers, or one assistant; at 96, one teacher, one assistant, and one probationer.

21. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] It is proposed to ask the parents to make up any difference over what the capitation grant comes to: do you think it is within the ability of parents to do so?—Yes, if the board and lodging were assessed at so-much per annum.

22. How much would you say?—It would vary very considerably, as the schools differ very much. Roughly speaking, I should say it would be worth about £30; but, on the other hand, in many of these schools the teachers practically earn their board and lodging by the work they do in assisting in domestic duties outside of school-hours.

23. Do you think it is better to fix this scale for them, or to treat such localities as special districts?—I should endeavour to prevent "sweating," by not allowing them to receive such low salaries, even if they were willing to take them.

24. *Mr. Stewart.*] In the interest of education, what is your opinion as to the establishment of a colonial scale?—I think it is very desirable.

25. Have you any house allowance?—No.

26 None whatever?—No.

27. Are there any schools in the country districts of Nelson where there are no houses attached—I mean the ordinary established schools?—I cannot be quite certain.

Mr. Hogben: Twenty-two altogether, reckoning only schools over 20.

29. *Mr. Stewart.*] Would it be possible to establish anything like a just and equitable scale unless we take the question of house allowance into consideration?—No, it would not.

30. In this educational district in some places there is not only a residence, but a very large piece of ground, sometimes 10 acres in extent, attached, and a considerable income is made off that ground: is that not so?—Yes, that is so.

31. Does that weigh with teachers in connection with appointments?—Yes, it does.

32. You stated that in these aided schools many of the teachers performed household duties?—Yes.

33. Are they satisfied with that state of affairs?—No; they often complain greatly of it.

34. It was given in evidence that the teachers in that class of schools only perform these household duties if they like: is that so?—In some cases.

35. Do you not think it would be better if the Board were to say that no such duties were to be performed?—Yes.

36. Do you think that would be a reliable protection?—Yes.

37. Is it a fact that in the present state of affairs the teacher would be placed in a very invidious position if she refused to perform these duties?—Yes.

38. You consider your teachers in the household schools in a serious difficulty in regard to this matter?—Yes.

39. With regard to the difference in duties of town and country schools, supposing in a country school of 37 or 38 you had a headmaster and an assistant, and on the other hand in a town school you had an assistant with a class of 50 to teach, would the work of the latter be more arduous than that of the assistant in a country school with all the standards?—That is a question I am not able to answer, seeing that I have not had experience in a country school. I could simply go by what I have been told by other teachers.

40. Have you had a teacher who had been in a country school such as I describe, and afterwards been an assistant of your own?—Yes.

41. What was his opinion?—That the country-school teacher has the easier position.

42. Have you had more than one case of that nature?—Yes.

43. Is there any considerable nervous strain in managing large classes in town schools?—Yes.

44. Which children do you think are the hardest to manage, town or country children?—I should say town children.

45. With regard to the subdivision of the schools, you think that subdivision should not exist?—Yes.

46. You think there would be a gain in efficiency if amalgamation took place?—Yes.

47. Do you attach any value to the actual work of practical science in your schools?—Yes.

48. Do you think it has a great educational effect?—Yes.

49. Do you believe such work possible in small schools?—No.

50. *Mr. Hill.*] What is the present average attendance of your school?—283.

51. You could manage more pupils without any difficulty?—Yes.

52. Do you think there is an advantage in having separate departments for boys and girls?—No; I am not able to see any advantage.

53. You are not in favour of separation?—No.

54. Would you find it difficult to organize a school where the boys and girls are merged?—Of course, there would be a certain amount of difficulty at first, but it could be overcome.

55. Would you expect a larger salary in such a case?—I should be perfectly prepared to continue with my present salary.

56. Do you think that the tone of the departments would suffer if they were merged?—I think not; not having any experience of mixed schools, I cannot, of course, speak with confidence upon that point.

57. Do you think that the efficiency would be likely to suffer?—No; it should be rather increased.

58. Then, I understand you to say that by the amalgamation of the schools in Nelson the standard of efficiency would be greatly improved?—Yes, because the children could be classified better.

59. You suggest, in the first of your recommendations from the Nelson Institute, that in districts in which the cost of living is exceptionally high the salaries of the teachers should be raised proportionately: has not a district of this kind corresponding advantages?—By the term "districts" we did not mean education districts. I think there are nothing but disadvantages in many cases.

60. Give me an example?—Take many of the schools on the Buller River; take Lyell, Murchison, Inangahua Junction, places in some of which in the winter-time there are only about three hours of sunlight: In places like these, where there is merely a small mining population, people are deprived of many enjoyments and comforts that they would get in a town such as Nelson, and they have nothing by way of compensation.

61. In No. 3 of your recommendations, could you suggest any other plan? Have there been any suggestions made by any of the teachers with a view to overcoming the difficulty?—None save the one stated in the recommendation; that is the only one that has been brought forward.

62. Do you think, are you of the opinion, that the teachers would be satisfied if such a recommendation were approved of?—Yes, because during the other three-quarters of the year these schools get a normal attendance.

63. Has the difference been estimated between the March and the June attendances in this district?—Yes; I have had it submitted to me two or three times.

64. Is the difference very marked?—Yes, very marked; as much as 30 per cent. in some cases.

65. You have read the proposed scale?—Yes.

66. Do you think it provides generous payment to the small schools?—Yes.

67. Much better than the payments now made by the Nelson Board?—Yes.

68. Then, you think there is a great improvement?—Yes.

69. With reference to your recommendation 6, do you mean to ask that special salaries shall be paid to the teachers in the town schools, or that, assuming there is an average attendance of so-many, and the scale is made up on a certain capitation grant, the gross amount which would be paid by the department shall be divided amongst the teachers concerned in these separate departments?—The meeting at which that question was discussed was chiefly composed of town teachers, and we did not think it would be fitting for us to suggest what the salaries in our special case should be; but we decided to bring under your notice the fact that some special regulations should be made. For instance, the attendance at the Boys' Central is between 250 and 300, and according to the proposed scale we should have an infant mistress, although we have no infants. It is obvious that some modification of the scale would have to be made to meet our special needs; but we have not thought it fitting to make any special recommendation.

70. Would the distribution of the proposed capitation grant among the teachers of the six schools at the present time raise or lower the present salaries?—It would amount in the aggregate to about £150 more than is at present paid, while we have two teachers and two probationers more on our staff at present than would be allowed if the whole were to be amalgamated into one school.

71. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Your salary is now £300; according to the Board's scale a headmaster's salary ranges from £250 to £300: how did you manage to get up to the £300?—I was appointed at a salary of £300 before the scale was brought into operation; other teachers are supposed to apply to the Board for an increase. At the beginning of the year the Board considers applications.

72. *Mr. Hogben.*] In reply to Mr. Davidson, you admitted it would be a gain in efficiency to have a sewing-mistress in a school of from 35 to 40, as against making the limit 35 for an unassisted sole teacher: is that so?—Yes, with the understanding that the teacher would be a more efficient one if a higher salary were paid.

73. Do you not think that there is a limit to the receptive power of a boy or girl, and that it should determine the number of pupils a teacher can take?—Yes.

74. Whatever amount of class-teaching there may be, there is still involved the question of individual tuition, is there not?—Yes.

75. Either directly or indirectly?—Yes.

76. Such staffing would not be your ideal in regard to those schools?—No, it would not be the ideal staffing.

77. You were asked a question as to whether a country school of 36 with all standards and two teachers was harder or easier to manage than a town school class of 50, and you said you considered the country school the easier to manage, did you not?—Yes.

78. Would you hold that opinion still if you took the average size of such schools—say, two teaching 55 with all standards, and one to teach a class of 50?—I should still say that the country school with two on the staff would be the easier.

79. To teach all standards?—Yes.

80. You stated that there would be difficulty in teaching practical science in small country schools: did you refer to physical science or observational science?—I referred at the time to physical science.

81. Would that remark apply with so much force to observational science, such as botany?—No.

82. Which do you think the better in such schools—observational studies from botany downwards or physical science?—I should say that observational studies are the more useful in such schools.

83. So that the difficulty would not be so great as if it were physical science that was being considered?—No.

84. *The Chairman.*] You stated that the efficiency of the Nelson schools would be greatly improved by amalgamation into one central school?—Yes.

85. Do you think there would be any counter disadvantage by a falling-off in the aggregate attendance?—There would be unless arrangements were made to convey the younger children from the outlying parts of the town; still I think it could be arranged so that the attendance would be increased rather than decreased.

86. You say it is only from hearsay when you tell us that the work of a country teacher who has several standards to take charge of is less arduous than the work of a first or second assistant in a town school with but one standard to manage?—Yes, that is so.

87. You say that it is the experience of more than one teacher, do you not?—Yes.

88. How many?—Three or four have stated this as their experience.

89. Were the salaries of those men materially increased when they became assistants in town schools from what they were previously when in charge of country schools?—In one case not very greatly; in the case of the others I think they were considerably improved; I am not certain.

90. Do you not think there must have been a considerable improvement in the salaries paid if they would abandon the country schools to become assistants in town schools?—I cannot answer the question offhand; in one case there was certainly no very great increase.

91. Then, if there was no great increase, as you say, now do you account for the fact that they were willing to leave the positions they had in order to take up more arduous work?—The amount of work may have been greater, but no doubt they were willing to undertake it for a slight increase of pay.

92. Would there be any other advantages?—Yes; the advantages of moving into town—the social advantages of town-life.

93. Do you think assistants in town are more likely to succeed in their profession than isolated teachers in the country?—That depends very much on the organization of the school to which they belong; if a teacher remains in charge of the same class I do not think he gets the same grip of the work as a teacher who takes charge of all classes at different times.

94. I want to be clear upon this point. You consider that an assistant in a large school in town, teaching one class, has a more arduous undertaking than a country teacher who has to manage a number of standards?—Yes; it is the experience of a number of the teachers themselves.

95. Would you be surprised to learn that that experience differs entirely from that of some of the most competent men who have given evidence before us?—Yes, I am surprised.

96. With regard to house allowance, do you think it would be reasonable to allow the same amount to a teacher in a district where the rents are comparatively low as would be allowed to teachers in large centres where the rents are high? In other words, do you think there should be a differential house allowance for teachers in charge of smaller-sized schools in, say, Nelson as compared with Wellington?—Yes, I think there should be.

97. You would base the amount of the house allowance on the rents paid?—Yes.

GEORGE TALBOT, Chairman of the Nelson Education Board.

Mr. Talbot: The secretary of the Board will be able to give the Commission full information as to the staffing in our district. As to the payment of salaries, they are lower than in other districts. Of course, we receive the same capitation, but we have a large number of scattered country schools. The salaries are consequently lower than in other districts, with the exception, I believe, of Taranaki and West Coast.

98. *The Chairman.*] I presume you have a great number of country schools to look after?—I think that, proportionately, the number is greater than in any other district in the colony, and it has a very serious effect on our funds. We have household schools in respect to which we pay £4 a head, and aided schools where we pay £4 a head and a Committee allowance of 11s. 6d. a head. On each of these aided schools we lose 16s. 6d. a head. We have comparatively few large schools. In the larger districts the schools help to support the smaller ones, and yield what we should call a good profit. The last year or two, through the causes mentioned, we have been at our wits' ends to know how to make both ends meet. We have always been able to make both ends meet till this last year, when we went to the bad £600 or £700.

99. Was that an exceptionally bad period?—Yes, in this way: there have been more of these new country schools opened, we have had smaller attendances in other schools, and our funds have been short in consequence.

100. I presume that the opening of these new schools has been due to the increased land-settlement going on?—The schools have been opened in freshly populated districts, but the land-settlement is not going on so largely as we could wish. We have an excellent climate, but no great extent of land.

101. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you think that your schools are unnecessarily divided in some of your centres?—Perhaps they are in a few instances.

102. What is the distance between the four Nelson side-schools: are they within a mile of each other?—I think that at the outside no one of these schools is more than a mile from another.

103. Is Toitoi Valley out of the town?—Oh, no; in the town.

104. Would it not be possible to amalgamate some of these schools?—Yes, I think so. It could also be done in the country in some places.

105. The boys and girls are kept separate, are they not?—Yes; but only in a few instances. Nelson and Richmond are the only cases at present.

106. Do you think that necessary?—No; I did once, but not now.

106A. Are your aided schools more than three miles from each other by road?—I think most of them are that distance. It is sometimes difficult to ascertain the distances when the applications are sent in. It has been understood that they should be at least three miles apart, but in some cases I do not think they are.

107. Do you not think that the difficulty of aided schools should be got over? We in Otago have not adopted the system of the small schools?—I do not see how it could be got over, except by fixing a minimum attendance, as I understand you have done. We recently had an application to establish a household school for one child, and, of course, we drew the line at that.

108. It is recommended by the teachers of your district that there should be a minimum salary for certificated teachers of £70, and that if the proposed £5 subsidy does not amount to £70 the parents be required to make up the balance. Supposing, for instance, there were only two children, £5 would be paid by the Board, leaving £60 to be made up by the parents: do you think that would be possible?—I think our present system is better. We pay a capitation, and the parents are required to guarantee to make the amount up to £20, with board and lodgings. There is a difficulty in getting certificated teachers for household schools.

109. Do you think it essential to get certificated teachers?—It is not always possible to get them at a small salary, but we get them where possible.

110. Do you think it possible for parents to make up such a difference as £60?—No.

111. *Mr. Davidson.*] I find from the last available return that out of 123 schools in the Nelson District there are sixty-six with an average attendance of under 20 each: in your opinion, are these sixty-six schools absolutely necessary?—Well, yes. We might dispense with a few, but as a rule they are necessary. The people live so far apart in the back districts that the children would not be able to get any education but for the establishment of these smaller schools.

112. Have you ever given attention to the question of the conveyance of children to school?—Yes; it has been brought before our Board on several occasions.

113. Do you not think it would be possible to amalgamate some of these smaller schools, and to convey the children to the schools?—We made inquiries in one case as to cost, but we considered it would be cheaper to establish an extra school.

114. Apart from the question of cost, do you not think there is a difference in the education given in the larger and the smaller schools?—Yes; that given in the larger schools is far preferable.

115. Then, if the system of amalgamation were proved to be more economical, would you approve of the plan being tried?—Yes; I would have no objection to a trial.

116. Your city schools have an average attendance of 960: have you any knowledge of the system adopted of grouping children for instruction in Dunedin, Invercargill, Napier, Auckland, or any town of a size similar to that of Nelson?—No; I cannot say I have any particular knowledge of that system.

117. Then, you do not know that in a town of similar size there would not be more than one or two at the most mixed schools for 960 children?—In districts nearly as large as our own there are a lesser number of schools. I believe it would be an advantage to lessen the number.

118. What is your opinion as to separate schools?—I believe that mixed schools are better.

119. I find that your cost of inspection is £810 a year, or more than the £500 received by the Board: would you approve of the Inspectors being placed under the control of the department, and paid by the department instead of by the Board?—No, I cannot say I should.

120. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think that the colonial scale as proposed would be of advantage to your district?—Looking at it all round, I think it would be. Of course, we would not like to have the control taken away from us in a certain measure.

121. In what way would the proposed scale affect your control—the money would be paid to you, and you would pay it to the teachers?—Unless the Board had absolute power to transfer or promote, I do not think it would work altogether satisfactorily.

122. You have spoken of the number of schools in Nelson and Richmond: have you any idea of the population of Richmond?—Yes; 543 at the late census.

123. How far apart are the two Richmond schools?—70 yards; not more.

124. And yet you go to the expense of maintaining two schools with an average attendance of only 108?—If they were mixed we should have to have the two schools—one would not be large enough.

125. If they were mixed schools, would not one head-teacher be sufficient, working them as one school?—It would not be impossible, but they are rather far apart.

126. They are wooden buildings, and could be moved?—Yes, that could be done.

127. And a considerable saving would be effected?—Yes.

128. You think that the extreme distance between the four city side-schools is not more than a mile?—No; not more, say, than a mile and a half.

129. Do you not think that two of these side-schools would be sufficient—one on the east and one on the west of the town: would not that effect a great saving in salaries?—I have not gone into it, but it would certainly appear so; I would advocate that.

130. Would it not make the schools more efficient?—Yes.

131. Many of the teachers employed by your Board have been in your service for a considerable number of years?—Yes; a few.

132. Do you think the average age of the teachers is higher now than it was a few years ago?—I do not think it is higher; a sufficient number of young men come in, and the pupil-teachers pass on to be ordinary teachers.

133. What happens when a teacher gets old?—I do not think that has often happened—at least, not where they have become incapacitated.

134. Do you know of any provision in the Education Act for excluding children of any given standard from any school?—No.

135. Have you referred to your legal adviser as to whether you have power to do this?—No; it has been done with the knowledge, if not with the consent, of the department.

136. Are you aware that it was decided by the Supreme Court in a Christchurch case that there was no such power?—Yes, I was aware of it.

137. Supposing a boy at one of your side-schools wished to go to the central school, do you think you would have legal power to refuse?—I do not know whether we should consider that we had legal power, but should decline to admit him.

138. Supposing a parent raised that question?—Well, it has never been raised yet.

139. *Mr. Luke.*] Have you any difficulty in getting boys to join the teaching profession?—They are more difficult to get than girls. It has been our custom to pay more to boys than to girls, but that is not approved by the department.

140. Has the system of dividing the boys and girls been recently begun, or has it existed from the beginning?—From the beginning. It existed under the Nelson Provincial Act before the present Education Act came into force.

141. *Mr. Hill.*] You said just now that you had great trouble in connection with your aided schools?—Yes; they are carried on at a loss.

142. Have you estimated the loss on the fifty-eight schools which have an average attendance below 20?—I have not done so.

143. These fifty-eight schools are carried on at a loss of 5s. a head each?—Yes; and there is a further loss of the Committee allowance of 11s. 6d. a head, making a total of 16s. 6d. a head. The Committee allowance is paid to the aided schools, but not to the household schools.

144. Are the household schools carried on in buildings erected by the Board?—Yes, partly; only one instance.

145. When there are less than fifteen children?—Yes, in some cases.

146. Do you think you should give Committee allowances to such small schools?—The 11s. 6d. is not given to the teachers, but it is paid to the Committee.

147. Do the Committees assist the teachers in the payment of salaries?—No, not out of this allowance.

148. Do your teachers actually live on the pittance the Board gives them?—Yes, unfortunately. In some cases they are worse off than the teachers of household schools, as they do not receive their board.

149. Do you require certificated teachers for these schools?—Yes, when we can get them.

150. Can you tell us how many of these teachers hold certificates from the department, or have been trained under your Board as pupil-teachers?—They have nearly all been trained as pupil-teachers. Some have taken up the position after passing the Sixth Standard.

151. You recognise that the salaries are not sufficient: can you suggest what would be a fair salary for schools with attendance below 20?—I think £70 or £80 would be a fair salary.

152. These schools are generally in charge of women?—Yes, most of them.

153. Do you think that women are more suitable than men in outlying districts?—As suitable. In some instances where there is rough country and no lodging facilities it would not be right to place a female teacher in charge.

154. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How do you account for the fact that most of your town schools have mistresses instead of masters at their head: have masters not applied?—It is so long since some of them were appointed that I forget.

155. Do you experience a difficulty in getting male pupil-teachers?—Yes.

156. Do you think the department discourages the appointment of female teachers?—No; the department discourages the inequality in salaries of pupil-teachers.

157. You have 25 per cent. more female than male teachers?—We have. We do not choose them. We submit the applications to the Committees, and the one selected is generally appointed.

158. You send all the names to the Committees?—Invariably. We send the names of all certificated applicants.

159. Do you not think the adoption of a colonial scale of salaries would be advisable?—Our teachers are certainly not paid so well as in other districts, nor so well as they ought to be.

160. If you did not have separate schools it would make a difference?—It would make some, but not much.

161. You fix 37 scholars as the limit for one teacher?—Yes.

162. You then add a pupil-teacher, and this is sufficient up to 65?—Yes.

163. At Waimea West, with an average attendance of 40, the teacher gets £150, and at Spring Grove, with an average of 52, £145 is paid: how do you account for that?—They are paid according to scale. The present teacher at Waimea West does not get so much as that set down.

164. What about residences?—We have residences in the country.

165. Do you consider applications from outside applicants, or do you boycott teachers from other districts?—Not altogether. We have some teachers who have come from outside. As a rule, all things being equal, we appoint teachers from our own districts.

166. Do you transfer teachers who may not be getting on well with Committees from one school to another?—We have done so. We would like the power; when both Committees are agreeable we do so.

167. Do you not think the Board is rather liberal in the establishment of household schools?—Perhaps so, but the districts are so scattered that many children would not get any education without them.

168. I suppose you would have some difficulty in grouping these household schools?—Yes, in most instances.

169. Is the cost of living higher here than elsewhere?—A little higher in Nelson; much higher on the West Coast.

170. Would there be any difficulty in transferring teachers?—Yes, in many cases; it would lead to a good deal of friction.

171. Do you pay your teachers for giving instruction to pupil-teachers?—Yes; £8 a year, and half-rates in cases of failure.

172. Does your Board favour giving female pupil-teachers the same salary as males?—I should have no objection if the males were not brought down.

173. How many pupils is a teacher able to teach?—Thirty-six in the country districts, where one teacher has to take several standards.

174. Is a female teacher as efficient up to 30 pupils as a male?—Yes.

175. Still, you do not care about paying the same salary?—I do not know that. If the salaries were equal we should not appoint so many female teachers.

176. Have you a difficulty in getting assistant teachers here?—No; there is not much difficulty in getting assistant or pupil teachers.

177. *Mr. Smith.*] You said that the Nelson District had a larger proportion of smaller schools than any other district. Nelson has forty-three small schools out of 143, whereas Marlborough has forty out of sixty-two?—Yes, I believe that is so.

178. How far apart are the Brightwater and River Terrace Schools?—Not much over a mile.

179. Perhaps under a mile?—It is not a great distance.

180. One had an attendance of 41 and the other of 43: would it not be advantageous to amalgamate them?—It would be a great advantage. We have tried several times to do so.

181. How far apart are the Wakefield and Pigeon Valley Schools?—About two or three miles. Some of the children attending the Pigeon Valley School come a long way down the valley, and the roads are very rough.

182. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] What is the amount of your building grant?—Just over £2,000.

183. Would there be any difficulty in moving school-buildings?—In some cases they might be joined, but in most cases new buildings would be necessary.

184. *Mr. Hogben.*] If the Board had the power to appoint and transfer in its own hands, would it be satisfied with the colonial scale of staffs and salaries?—Yes.

185. Are you aware that the power to transfer is now in the hands of the Boards, as provided by the Act of 1877 [section read]? Is there any difficulty about your Board using that power?—There is a difficulty, inasmuch as the Committees have to be consulted.

186. Would there be any objection on principle to the Board carrying out a reasonable transfer in spite of the opinion of a Committee, supposing the Board still considered it necessary?—Yes; it would not be considered expedient to do so.

187. What is the nature of the expediency?—To do so would put the Board on bad terms with the Committee, I presume. It is the general idea here, whether correct or not, that the Board cannot appoint unless the Committee approves.

188. But you do not find that in the Act?—No.

189. Have you any number-definition between household and aided schools?—Yes. Not less than three for a household school, and not less than twelve for an aided school. That rule has just been made, but was not retrospective.

190. The returns for the December quarter of 1900 show twenty-four schools with an average attendance of 20, and fourteen with an average of from 1 to 5: are these latter all household schools?—Yes.

191. There are ten schools with an average attendance of from 6 to 9?—Yes, I suppose so.

192. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you pay the teachers a fixed amount?—No; we pay them £4 a head.

193. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you consider there should be a minimum salary for teachers, whether certificated or not?—Yes.

194. What should be the minimum for an uncertificated teacher?—I should say, about £50 or £60.

195. What is the board of these teachers worth?—£20 or £25 a year.

196. Taking £25, that would leave £35, or seven pupils at £5 each required to bring the amount up to £60?—Yes.

197. Do you not think it hard to expect the householders to give money besides board and lodging?—Yes; but what else can be done under the circumstances?

198. What is a good domestic servant paid in the country districts of Nelson?—About 10s. a week.

199. With board and lodging, that is practically £50 a year?—Yes.

200. Do the teachers of household schools perform other duties?—As a rule, it is optional with the teachers.

201. I suppose, of course, they give four hours' tuition?—Oh, yes.

202. You have looked through the proposed scale of payment of pupil-teachers: is that for males higher or lower than your scale?—It is higher than ours, and, of course, much higher for female teachers, as they are all to be paid alike. On the whole the general scale is rather high.

203. *The Chairman.*] The large increase in your smaller schools is owing to people going back into the country where there was no settlement before?—Yes. These people are generally poor, and cannot afford to contribute towards salaries.

204. They are generally a long way from each other?—Yes.

205. Before you establish aided schools do you make ample inquiries?—Yes; we get lists of children from parents, and applications are often deferred time after time for the purpose of getting further information.

206. In fourteen instances the teachers receive free board and lodging?—Yes, in the case of household schools. In such cases the parents must guarantee £20 a year, even if there is only one pupil.

207. Who appoints the teachers in these cases?—The Board advertises for them in the usual way, and approves of the appointments.

208. Have you any of these teachers belonging to the same family as the pupils?—We have had such instances, but we discourage it. In one case the teacher was the sister of the pupils.

Mr. Ellis: There are two cases at present.

209. *The Chairman.*] Do you insist on separate buildings for the schools?—No, not for household schools.

210. Are the pupils confined to members of the one family?—In some instances members of other families attend.

211. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] I suppose these schools are examined in the usual way by the Inspectors?—Yes.

Mr. Harkness: The teachers are appointed temporarily in the first place, and their retention depends on the results of the examinations.

212. *The Chairman.*] I suppose the large increase in the number of schools has added to the labours of the Inspectors?—Yes.

213. Have the Inspectors been able to overtake their work?—Yes; but we have had to refuse some applications for examination of private schools.

214. What is the distance between the two schools at Richmond?—They each stand on an acre of land, adjoining each other with a fence between them.

215. Are children of all ages taught at the Tasman Street School?—No; only up to the First and Second Standards. The boys of higher standards go to the Central School, and the girls to the Toitoi Valley School.

216. Do you not think there would be a large saving in combining the Richmond schools?—There would be some saving, but I do not know whether it would be very large.

217. The Motueka School, with an average attendance of 124, shows an annual expenditure in salaries and allowances of £324, whilst the two Richmond schools, with a combined attendance of 108, has an expenditure of £406?—That is largely attributable to the headmaster at Richmond getting a salary beyond the scale rate. He is an old teacher, and some time ago the Board gave him a fixed salary of £200 instead of the scale rate, which should be £140.

218. If the two Richmond schools were combined, would there not be improved efficiency in education itself as well as economy?—I would not say there would be in this case. In my opinion, the head-teacher in the Girls' School is as good as any in the whole educational district. I do not think anything could be gained in that way.

219. Do you not think the general conduct of the boys and girls would be better if they were in the same school?—Their conduct compares favourably with that in other schools, and I do not know whether there would be any improvement in this respect if they were mixed. At one time I was greatly opposed to mixed schools; but from what I have seen of late years I have altered my opinion. I do not think there would be any improvement in this instance. In some instances there would be more efficient teaching by grouping, but in other cases there would be less.

220. You do not think it would be injurious?—No, I do not think that.

221. *Mr. Stewart.*] If through any accident the Board were to lose the two Richmond teachers, do you not think it would then be an advantage to combine the schools?—Well, to be honest, I must reply in the affirmative.

THOMAS BAILIE, Member of the Nelson Education Board, examined.

Mr. Bailie: It has been advocated that children should be conveyed to schools. I think that would be a good idea where conveyances can be obtained. In some cases rivers intervene, but where there are no such obstacles children might be conveyed to school, at great benefit to themselves and a saving to the Board.

222. *The Chairman.*] I suppose foot-bridges could be put over the rivers?—Yes, in some cases; but that was a matter outside the Board's functions.

223. The children could travel on horseback in some cases, I suppose?—Yes, they might. The children at Black's Point, near Reefton, could very easily be taken to the good central school in Reefton, a distance of two or three miles.

224. Do you think, if parents were allowed £1 or £2 for each child, that the question of conveyance could be got over?—Yes, perhaps. But if the central Committees had power to advertise for conveyances, that would be a cheaper way.

225. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Are your opinions generally similar to those expressed by your Chairman?—Yes, much the same.

226. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you aware that the system of conveying children to school has been carried out with success in Victoria?—That is where I got the idea from. I have advocated it on the Board.

227. Are you aware that the system has been tried in Pennsylvania, and that in a district eleven miles long by three or four miles wide one central school has taken the place of six smaller schools?—I was not aware of it; I am pleased to hear that it is so.

228. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think it would be possible to carry out this system in the Waimeas?—I think it could be done. Two or three schools would do for the whole valley.

229. *Mr. Hogben.*] As to the cost of living, I suppose that is greater in some parts of the Nelson District than in others?—Yes; a great part of the Nelson District is on the West Coast, where they do not grow anything. Most of the goods have to be carted, and the cost of carriage is high.

230. What is your estimate of the value of board and lodging given to the teachers of household schools?—When living with a family 10s. or 12s. a week would be about the figure in the settled districts. In other parts it should be more. £30 a year would be a fair average.

231. Do you approve of the principle of allowing young ladies to be paid for teaching their brothers and sisters?—I do not, on principle; but there are cases where it has been carried out with satisfactory results.

H. PHILLIPS, Member of the Nelson Education Board.

Mr. Phillips: I may say, with regard to these aided schools, that I think they are a necessity, and that in this respect we have fared very well in giving education to the children of the struggling settlers who have gone into the back country and developed homes for themselves.

232. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] I understood you were in debt?—No, we are not in debt. Owing to decrease in attendance the finances of the Board have suffered; two hundred of a decrease will make a considerable difference, and we find we have that number of children less than we had two years ago.

233. *Mr. Hill.*] Supposing the Government gave £50,000 for building purposes, would you expect the ordinary capitation, or in cases where a district is increasing rapidly would you give more to such districts?—Yes, I think so. We built the Boys' School, but had to borrow the money to do so.

234. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Borrowed it from another account?—Borrowed it straight out from the vendor at 5 per cent.; the Government advanced a small sum. I may mention Mr. Walker gave us some assistance towards getting out of debt.

235. *Mr. Luke.*] You received some money from the Maintenance Fund, and repaid it?—Yes.

236. *Mr. Hill.*] With interest?—No.

237. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you consider these small schools a benefit generally?—Yes; it has been my aim in life to advocate those schools. There are lands about here that would never have been utilised if the settlers had not taken them up on the understanding that education would be provided for their children.

238. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you not think that your Board has been rather liberal in the establishment of these aided schools?—No; this is a very scattered district, and we have had several applications for them, so that I do not see that we could have one less than we already have. We have asked for no assistance in this connection, and we are still solvent.

239. As a rule, is there any pressure brought to bear on Education Boards to establish these schools?—Yes, a good deal of pressure; they say they want assistance to educate their children, and, though we do not give them all the money for these schools to begin with, we gradually increase the grant as we see they are in earnest.

240. Do you think that the Inspectors of Schools should be controlled by the central department in Wellington, and not by the Education Boards?—I think our Inspectors are quite satisfied as under the Board now, though I think they should be transferred every five or six years.

241. Then, you would suggest that they should not remain longer in a district than the period of time you mention?—Yes.

241A. Your Board has experienced considerable difficulty in securing the services of male pupil-teachers: is that not on account of the small salaries which you offer?—No, I do not think so. We have lots of male teachers applying. I think we had fifty or sixty applicants only recently for vacancies; they use the Board as a stepping-stone. In the case of a lady teacher who sent in her resignation, and stated as her reason want of controlling-power, we inquired into the case and found she was about to be married.

242. *The Chairman.*] I notice that the girls' schools in Nelson are staffed by female teachers: what proportion of female teachers have you to males?—The Inspector would tell you we generally suit public convenience in that respect.

243. Speaking from your experience, have you found any difference in the teaching capacities of males and females?—When the female teachers remain in our service I think they are better than males.

244. Do you think female teachers exercise as much control over the boys in a boys' school as would male teachers?—Yes, I think so.

245. Do you think that male teachers would be less successful in charge of a girls' school than the teachers they have now—*i.e.*, females?—I think they would be less successful, with this qualification: up to a certain point male pupil-teachers are not so bright as females, but when they arrive at maturity I think males are better.

246. If a headmaster with male assistants was appointed to the charge of a girls' school, you are of opinion that the school would not be a success?—I am of that opinion.

247. Why would it not be a success: do you not think that the girls would pay more attention to a male teacher than to a mistress?—No, I think not.

248. Do you not think that the discipline would be better?—It might be; but I think the results would be worse. I should prefer to see the schools mixed, and under the charge of a headmaster, but with the classes separate. I think the amalgamation of various schools might take place with good results, especially so with the Nelson schools.

249. Would you approve of female teachers presiding over boys' schools?—I believe that in all small mixed schools female teachers are better than male teachers. I should like to see a large mixed school in Nelson with a headmaster.

250. *Mr. Luke.*] You are a member of the Education Board?—Yes, for the past twenty odd years.

STEAD ELLIS, Secretary to the Nelson Education Board, examined.

251. *Mr. Davidson.*] Is your scale of staff strictly adhered to in the Nelson District?—In the smaller schools it is; but in the larger schools the attendance fluctuates considerably, and the Inspectors advise as to whether appointments should be made or not.

252. Your scale of salaries is not strictly adhered to in the case of certain individual teachers?—There are a few exceptions, including Stoke and the Richmond Boys' School.

Mr. Harkness: It was made a provision when the scale was introduced that it should not be retrospective.

254. *Mr. Davidson.*] The headmaster of the Richmond Boys' School is paid £200 instead of the scale rate of £140: has the Board considered the desirableness of transferring him to a position where he would receive a salary equal to about £200?—No, that question has never come before the Board. In fact, there are few places in this district where a teacher could get it.

255. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you not think there would be an advantage in combining schools?—I have always thought that the schools are, as a rule, too close to each other.

256. As to clause 3 of the recommendations of the Nelson Educational Institute [clause read], are you aware that the working-average of the schools throws out any day on which the attendance is less than one-half of the number on the roll?—Yes.

257. Is that a sufficient safeguard in special circumstances of this kind?—Generally, I think it is. In one case the March returns showed that the attendance of the school had never reached one-half.

258. *Mr. Hill.*] I see that your scale goes up to only £169?—Yes.

259. The Westport District High School is shown with an average of 465. Your scale shows Westport Boys' and Westport Girls': are they carried on separately, or have these departments been since merged?—There is only one school there now.

260. As to the central schools of Nelson, has the headmaster of the Boys' School any control over the headmistress of the Girls'?—No; she is quite independent of him.

261. What is her salary?—£175.

262. Do you not think that if these two schools were merged they could be carried on at less expense?—I do not think the Board would reduce any salaries.

263. Do you think £5 a head sufficient for all schools with an attendance of 20: would that improve their condition?—It would improve the condition of the teachers.

264. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider your scale of staffing sufficient?—It has always been considered sufficient.

265. Do you not think our proposed scale is more liberal as to staffs and salaries?—Yes.

266. Do you not think 25 per cent. difference between salaries of male and female teachers too great?—No. The male teachers are generally heads of families, whereas the females are generally single women.

267. If the salaries were equal your Board would probably employ more males?—Yes.

268. Is it not a fact that the cost of living is higher in one part of the district than in another part?—Yes.

269. Are there Committees in connection with these small aided schools?—Yes.

270. Do you think it would be an advantage if the Inspectors of other districts were to take up the work in your district occasionally?—It would tend to uniformity; but I do not know whether it would be an advantage.

271. You are aware that the Inspectors, at their conference, carried a resolution in favour of centralisation?—Yes.

272. You experience a difficulty in getting trained teachers owing to the great distance from a training centre?—We consider the training in our own schools sufficient.

273. You send all names of applicants to the Committees?—Yes, generally.

274. Do you not think that when teachers are paid according to grades of attendances, and a school has, say, 39, the teacher will make strenuous efforts to obtain 40, if that will give him a substantial increase—possibly by altering the register?—Well, I hope not.

275. Well, possibly there is a propensity in that direction?—I do not know.

276. Have there been any exchanges of teachers by your Board?—Yes, one or two.

277. Has the Committee been consulted?—Yes; both Committees.

277A. You do not adopt the system of promoting teachers?—No; we do not know that we have the power.

278. Under your scale a teacher and a pupil-teacher are employed when the attendance is from 37 to 65; therefore the same staff is required for 38 or 40 as for 65?—That is so. There must be some number where the staff is to be increased.

279. *Mr. Smith.*] Do you think the Board would have any difficulty in the amalgamation of schools such as Brightwater and River Terrace?—Yes, they would.

280. Was there much difficulty in getting the Brightwater Girls' School closed?—No, because there was another school erected alongside of it. The school closed has been empty ever since.

281. Has any attempt been made to group the schools?—Yes. The Brightwater School was built with the idea of being a central school, but the River Terrace people objected.

282. *Mr. Hogben.*] Can you state what your expenditure has been for the last three years under the heads of "teachers' salaries and allowances," "manual and technical instruction," "house allowances," and "general expenses," exclusive of scholarships, buildings, &c.?—I can get it out of the balance-sheet, and will hand it to you.

283. You say there are some cases in which the rule as to not including days on which the attendance is less than half the roll-number in the calculation of returns is not sufficiently generous: do you think any danger would be involved in raising the proportion from one-half to two-thirds?——

Mr. Stewart: I did not suggest two-thirds.

284. *Mr. Hogben.*] Well, suppose you raise it to any other definite proportion: supposing you did not allow to be counted days when the attendance was more than half, but less than that other proportion, do you not think that a higher average payment would be better than excluding these days?—Yes. I think it would be better than raising the proportion, although it might not fit in with the special requirements of a hop-picking district.

285. What is your estimate of the cost of board and lodging for unmarried teachers?—7s. to 10s. a week for females, and 10s. to 15s. for men.

286. What is the difference?—Well, men require more accommodation.

287. The cost of living is cheaper in the country than in the town?—I think it is. On some parts of the West Coast, such as Denniston, Burnett's Face, and Millerton, the cost would be 30 per cent. more.

288. Does it cost more for a man to keep up his status and dignity in the country?—Not more than in town.

289. Do you think it necessary to have separate scales for town and country?—No, I do not think so.

290. *Mr. Stewart.*] When the Inspectors advise as experts as to what shall be done in the staffing of the schools, is that advice followed?—Yes. In some cases there may be a protest from the Committee, which may cause the Inspectors to modify their views.

291. Was that the case with respect to the amalgamation of River Terrace and Brightwater?—No.

292. The Board has given way on that question because of the Committee's objections?—No. The residents generally objected. A public meeting was held.

293. *Mr. Hill.*] Some time ago the Board transferred some money from the General to the Building Fund, and thus what should have gone to salaries went to building?—Yes; but it has been paid back again. The Audit Department has raised some objection to that transaction—the paying of it back to general account.

294. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you think that the Board should exercise more authority than it has at present in regard to transfers and promotions?—I think it would be a great advantage if the Board could make transfers involving promotion. If the Board were to transfer a teacher from one school to another at present there might be a very unpleasant time.

295. At present there is no real promotion of teachers except at Wellington: do you consider that this state of things should continue?—I do not.

296. Do you think that promotions should be made in the same way as they are made in other branches of the public service?—Yes.

297. Do you think Inspectors should be responsible to the Boards or to the department?—To the Boards.

298. Do you not think it would be an advantage to transfer Inspectors occasionally?—Yes.

299. Do you think it would be an advantage if secretaries were occasionally transferred?—I do not know. I do not like the idea of transferring Inspectors so as to cause them to break up their homes. But they might be allowed to visit other districts.

300. *The Chairman.*] Have you any difficulty in finding teachers to fill vacancies?—No. When the salary is from £100 upwards there is a fairly large number of applicants. In the case of one position, the salary of £180, there were over thirty applications.

301. There are usually plenty of young girls and boys willing to accept pupil-teacherships?—There are plenty of young women, but very few well-qualified boys.

302. Have you lost many teachers?—As a rule they remain with us.

303. Have you ever reduced teachers' salaries because of attendance falling off?—It is constantly occurring every quarter. The salaries go up and down automatically with the attendance.

304. As to the exceptional cases, such as that at Richmond, do you think that matters could be adjusted satisfactorily if the Board had the right of transferring without consulting the Committees?—Yes, if the Board had authority; but at present I am quite sure that if the Board made transfers contrary to the wishes of the Committee things would be unpleasant.

305. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Following up the question of transfers of Inspectors and secretaries, do you not think that if these officers remain too long in a district they are apt to form prejudices in regard to teachers, favourable or otherwise?—I do not know whether the Inspectors form prejudices, but I am quite sure I do not. In all questions affecting teachers I always refer to the Inspectors' opinions.

306. It has been shown that in some instances teachers are receiving less than domestic servants: do you think that a teacher teaching two or three children in a household school gives more value than a good servant?—I think so; but the householders, as a rule, do not think so.

307. Do you think that a teacher teaching two or three children four hours a day does more valuable work than a servant who is able to cook a dinner and iron a shirt?—Yes. If the teacher is competent I think the work is more valuable, and deserving of higher wages.

308. Have you any information as to the proposals submitted by the Nelson teachers?—No; I have not seen them.

G. A. Harkness, Chief Inspector.

309. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Can you tell us the distance that your schools are apart?—Of late years we have made a rule that none should be established within four miles of another. Of those of which complaint has been made in the town and in the Waimeas, I may say that they are very old-established schools, having been established about, say, thirty or forty years; and many of these are very much nearer than they otherwise would have been. Brightwater has four schools within its immediate neighbourhood, each within two miles. That state of things throughout the district

is, however, very exceptional, and you very rarely find the schools established within so close a distance in other parts of our district.

310. In regard to the schools in the Brightwater district and in this town, how many are there, and by what proportion do you think you could reduce them?—There are six in the town, and twenty-two in what I may call the Waimea Plains.

311. Do you think, approximately, that you could halve those schools?—Yes, I think so, and with efficiency.

312. Would it be possible for you to get a map from the Survey Office, and place on that map the position each school occupies in this district?—It would be quite possible; but it would take a considerable time, as the district is a very scattered one.

313. I wish you to do so in order to see what possibility there is of reducing the number of these schools, for it seems to me that, if Nelson is to come within this proposed scale, to continue your present system would surely bar it. You think you could get that map for the Commission?—As I said, I could get it, but it would take some considerable time.

314. It could not possibly take very long. There are existing maps you could get: is that not so?—I do not know exactly. I will try to get you one from the Survey Office, though they sometimes refuse to let maps out.

315. *Mr. Davidson.*] Would you kindly tell us in what part of the educational district of Nelson separate schools obtain—I mean with regard to the separation of the sexes?—They only prevail in Nelson City and Richmond. They were more numerous, but we have continually advocated amalgamation, and amalgamation has taken place in my time in the case of schools at Wakefield and Westport.

316. You approve of the amalgamation of these schools?—Yes; we have recommended to the Board the amalgamation of the two Richmond schools.

317. As the educational expert and adviser of the Board, you would continue the amalgamation of those schools at present in existence, and you think you are wise in doing so?—Yes. With regard to the Nelson School, however, there is the important question of administration and finance. Some economy could undoubtedly be made by amalgamating the six schools in the town, and having only one; but, still, it would be at the expense of the teachers.

318. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You mean in the number and the salaries?—Yes, in both.

319. *Mr. Davidson.*] How many certificated teachers are there at present in the six city schools of Nelson?—Independent of pupil-teachers there are fifteen.

320. What number of pupil-teachers are there?—Thirteen, I think.

321. How many of the fifteen are males?—Five, at the Boys' Central School.

322. And the remaining ten are females?—Yes.

323. Have you looked into the suggested scale in order to find out how many certificated teachers of each sex would find employment in a single school of 960 and upwards?—No, I have not.

Mr. Hogben: Thirteen certificated teachers, counting the headmaster and eleven pupil-teachers.

324. *Mr. Davidson.*] I think you will admit, Mr. Harkness, that it is not a very serious matter so far as the staffing is concerned?—No, I am quite prepared to admit that.

325. There are at least six sites for the six schools?—Yes.

326. Then, if the Board made up its mind to establish one large central school for the City of Nelson, these sites would probably be sold, and the money obtained from them would go a long distance towards the cost of building an up-to-date, well-equipped school, would it not?—I would not say it would go largely towards it; but it is a pure matter of finance.

327. But if the building grant from the department were sufficient it would not matter in any way at all to the Board so long as they had the funds for the building of the central school?—Quite so.

328. I want to ask a few questions about these aided schools: In your opinion, many of the schools that have been established for a very considerable time might be amalgamated with others in the immediate neighbourhood?—Yes.

329. Do you think it advisable that there should be a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes, I do.

330. Have you considered the question of conveying children to schools as a means of centralisation?—Yes, it is not practicable; it has been contemplated once or twice here, but we have not found it would work to any financial advantage, for although the actual distance between the schools is not very great, still, on account of the geographical conditions of the country—the long valleys and inaccessible points—they are very hard to get at.

331. Is it not a fact that similar districts in America have been found eminently suitable for the centralising of schools and for the conveyance of children?—Yes, probably if the roads are good, but it is not so in our case.

332. *Mr. Stewart.*] You inspect these aided schools?—Yes.

333. On an average, how many have you in these aided schools? What percentage of attendance is present at your visits?—I could only tell you by an analysis of my inspection reports; as compared with the larger schools or district schools, I should say, approximately, about 80 per cent. of the roll-number.

334. You probably have an average of 3 or 4 pupils in these aided schools?—As a rule, not so low as that. The aided schools usually run up to from 10 to 20.

335. And in regard to the household schools?—Well, I should say from 2 to 10 or 12.

336. We have been told that there are a large number of uncertificated teachers in these household schools?—Yes, that is so.

337. Also that they are very young people?—Not in all cases. The difficulty is to supply a teacher at such a small salary who is prepared to go into these distant parts in the back country.

338. Is it a fact that the teachers are mostly young people who have only passed the Sixth Standard?—Yes; in these household schools we have young people in charge who have simply passed the Sixth Standard; that is common.

339. Viewed from an educational standpoint, do you think that wise?—I should prefer to have better material; but it simply amounts to this: that we have to do the best with the material available; and it is far better for these children to get some education than none at all.

340. Do you know of any cases of these household schools where individual members of the family are teachers?—Yes, I know of two cases we have now.

341. Do you think that it is desirable?—No, I do not; but it came about in this way: Formerly the schools were larger, and were always staffed by teachers from outside, but as the schools dwindled it became very much more difficult to get outsiders; consequently, members of the family were employed to teach. As a rule, however, the Board has always opposed the appointment of a member of the family, and it has only done so as a last emergency.

342. In these household schools we are given to understand that board and residence is found for the teacher?—Yes.

343. Has it ever come under your notice that the teacher of one of these schools practically pays for board and lodging by the work she does—domestic duties altogether outside her school duties?—Yes, in some cases.

344. In many?—I have heard it mentioned incidentally that such cases have occurred, but we have tried to prevent it as far as possible, and we have stipulated that the teachers shall not be expected to do anything outside of their school duties. In one case I know the householder engaged to pay £10 a year more if certain household duties were performed, but the applicant declined to take it.

345. Do you not think that it would be better to absolutely prohibit the performance of household duties, inasmuch as the householder in some cases—I do not say in all cases—would wink at the education being carried on so long as the household duties were satisfactorily performed?—As a general rule, I think it would be wise to have such a prohibition.

346. Speaking as the Inspector for the district, you are decidedly of opinion that a scheme for the amalgamation of these schools is in the public interest—in the interests of education and of the children of the district?—Yes, most decidedly.

347. And if a colonial scale brought such a state of affairs about you would be of opinion that it would be an advance not only in the direction of offering further inducement to teachers, but it would bring about a state of affairs eminently desirable from an educational standpoint?—Yes; in my opinion it is advisable to amalgamate.

348. You say you have advised this course before?—Yes.

349. What was the difficulty in carrying it out?—The consent of the School Committees usually, or getting the Board to agree. I do not think the question of the amalgamation of the Nelson town schools has ever been directly proposed.

350. But if it were you would give it your cordial support?—I would not say that, for I fail to see, from the figures placed before me, that any very great advantage would be gained.

351. You approve of all these little side-schools up to Standard II.?—I think they could be more efficiently worked, though probably you would lose in attendance.

352. Why?—On account of the distance.

353. But we have been told this morning that there is not such a great distance?—No; but even a half-mile further would affect the attendance of five-year-old children. By a suggestion of mine five of these infant-schools were reduced to four.

354. Do you not think all the difficulties might be met by two schools?—Yes.

355. *Mr. Hill.*] How many pupils do you think a properly trained teacher could manage efficiently in an unaided school—I mean, what would be your ideal number in a mixed school?—From 25 to 30.

356. How many schools have you in this district where the attendance is below that?—That is a question of figures, readily found from the returns.

357. I suppose you have over sixty?—Somewhere about that number—seventy-three, I think.

358. Could you give us an estimate as to how many schools it would be possible to merge in accordance with the plan suggested by Mr. Davidson?—You might be able to reduce the number by one-third. I could not tell exactly unless I went carefully into the figures.

359. In the boys' department you have certificated male teachers?—Yes.

360. Have you any female teachers in the boys' department?—Yes.

361. Have you any male teachers in the girls' department?—No, not at present.

362. Have you any special reasons why not?—I do not think there are any strong reasons.

363. Is there any more reason why female teachers should not be employed in the boys' department than male teachers in the girls'?—No, I do not think so.

364. Do you think your schools are better controlled by a master being in charge?—Yes, I think so.

365. At the present time you have a headmaster in the boys' school and a headmistress in the girls' school, who work independently of each other?—Yes.

366. Who instructs the pupil-teachers in the boys' school?—The head-teacher or headmistress of the Toitoi Valley School.

367. Sometimes the headmistress takes the boys as well as the girls?—Yes; the headmaster and headmistress by arrangement divide the work between them, one taking all the pupil-teachers in the city every alternate year.

368. I suppose the headmistress would be willing to take the boys, but is not willing to give over her authority to the master to take the girls?—I do not know about that.

369. You think the schools could be worked more efficiently if combined?—Yes.

370. Is it better to put females than males into these small schools to take charge?—I find, as a rule, that the females are better, from having more tact, patience, and vivacity; but for the sake of discipline I think headmasters are necessary in large schools.

371. Have you seen the proposed scale?—Yes; but I have not had time to look into it thoroughly.

372. Have you noticed the capitation allowance granted to these small schools?—Yes.

373. Are you satisfied with it: is it higher than under your own Board?—Yes.

374. Do you think that it would better your schools?—Yes; £3 15s. capitation, as at present granted by the department, is too small. I do not think it is possible to have a good system on that capitation.

375. Do you think it would be possible to have an efficient scheme on a capitation of £4?—I think that it requires more than a £4 capitation in this district.

376. Are you aware that out of the £4 proposed capitation 11s. 3d. is to be taken for Committee management?—Yes, I have just noticed it.

377. So that really the staffing has to be made on an allowance of £3 8s. 9d.?—I should like to point out in connection with that a matter that concerns the other outside expenses. Last year I find we spent £3,676 in expenses, such as Inspectors' salaries, training teachers, and so on, and that the Government proposes to give us £2,950; so that this present proposal would place the Board £726 to the bad.

378. But do you not think that must have been in consequence of taking a great deal of the capitation allowance for office requirements—more so than other Boards?—No, I do not think so.

379. Have you worked out the expenses of your Board for office maintenance and inspection?—Yes; I could give you figures for last year.

380. What is the average attendance in your district?—4,800.

381. There are two Inspectors?—Yes, and one secretary.

382. What is the cost of inspection?—£810 last year.

383. Is that not very large?—No.

383A. Were travelling-expenses included?—Yes; £260.

384. What is the salary of the Chief Inspector?—The Chief Inspector's salary is £300.

385. The gross amount?—Yes.

386. If the Government paid the Inspector's salary direct it would save the amount which is paid to you at the present time, would it not?—Yes, that is so.

387. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you think a deduction should be made in the case of a teacher who does not hold the minimum certificate according to the suggested scale?—I think a reduction justifiable in that case.

388. With regard to the highest minimum, it has been suggested that a C1 is high enough?—I do not think an A1 should be insisted upon.

389. Do you think the examinations should be conducted by the department independent of the university?—I think that the way to the certificate should be made open to all.

390. Do you consider that it should not be permissible to take Class D through the Matriculation Examination?—I see no objection to that. I think it should be possible for every teacher to make progress towards the A certificate.

391. Do you consider that if the Inspectors were under central control it would tend to uniformity of examination and inspection of schools?—I do not think they could be made uniform.

392. Would not the tendency be towards it?—Yes.

393. I understood you to say that it is a matter of the expense in regard to a central school—the expense of building and a site to build upon?—I am not quite clear; but I think the Board has only just paid the debt on the Central School—seven years after amalgamating.

394. With regard to sewing, do you employ sewing-mistresses?—Yes, in some cases, where there is a master in sole charge of a school.

395. Do the female pupil-teachers, as a rule, teach the sewing?—Yes.

396. You would not approve of a system in which a young lady is engaged as sewing-mistress, and, instead of teaching sewing, does school-teaching for five hours a day, for the salary of £12 a year?—No, I would not.

397. Do you notice any appreciable difference in the cost of living in the Nelson Education District from the cost in other districts in the colony?—I have not much acquaintance with the cost of living in the other districts. I do not think it has increased here.

398. Do you approve of Education Boards transferring teachers within their own districts?—Yes; in one or two cases it has been done here.

399. Successfully?—Yes, with the consent of the teachers and the Committees.

400. You consider the Education Boards would be justified in promoting their teachers if an opportunity arose?—Yes.

401. Do you think you should differentiate in the syllabus work required in the case of town and country schools?—Yes; I strongly advocated that myself at the Inspectors' conference.

402. *Mr. Smith.*] With reference to the household schools, you inspect them periodically?—Yes, we do not make a point of seeing them all.

403. Do you find, as a rule, the whole of the household children present?—Yes.

404. On your visits of inspection you begin with the register?—Yes, just the same as other schools.

405. You always find them correct?—Yes.

406. Is it your opinion that the education given in these small aided schools is equal to that obtained at the small country schools?—In many cases I have found it better. I have often been surprised at the excellence of training given in these small household schools.

407. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] You have no training institution at all?—No, unfortunately; it is a great defect.

408. You think that a colonial scale should be brought into operation?—Yes.
409. Do you think you would be able to get more assistant teachers?—Yes. Of course, our scale is more economical, for we employ pupil-teachers, while the proposed scale introduces assistants.
410. *Mr. Hogben.*] What period of time did you consider when drawing up your estimate of the expenses of your Board?—Up to the end of 1899. I got the list of expenses from Mr. Ellis.
411. Do you know the items the list included?—Yes; I have it here.
412. Did it include office expenses, salaries, travelling allowances and expenses?—Yes.
413. Clerical assistance to the treasurer?—Yes.
414. Departmental contingencies?—Yes.
415. What are the items included under the head of "Departmental contingencies," do you know?—No, I do not.
416. It is rather important, because the amount is £450 19s. 8d. Does it include the training of teachers?—My list does.
417. What is included under the head of "Training of teachers"?—The allowance paid to head-teachers for the instruction of pupil-teachers.
418. Well, you may deduct that: what does it leave then?—£202 is the amount paid for the training of pupil-teachers.
419. Are you aware that in Otago, Auckland, and Wellington nothing extra is paid?—No, I was not aware of it; it has been the rule here to pay.
420. You would not consider it unjust to include that in the increased salaries to head-teachers where there were pupil-teachers?—No, I should not.
421. Then you could deduct £202?—Yes.
422. You do not know the amount you could deduct for departmental contingencies?—No.
423. Did you notice that in the suggested scheme the amount now paid by Boards for similar expenses is £59,973 according to present scales, and that under the proposed scheme the amount payable to Boards for such purposes would be £65,303?—Yes.
424. So that the total available amount for the colony would be raised?—Yes.
425. If it were based on that year it would be simply a question of distribution of that £65,000 odd?—Yes.
426. Then, if the difficulty occurs for this district it would not occur for the colony as a whole?—No. The largest item on my list was Committee allowances, £912 7s. 6d. a head.
427. Do you know the duties of the Committee—what they are expected to do in the Nelson District for this sum per head?—Yes; the upkeep of buildings, cleaning, firing, and so on.
428. Do you think that the upkeep of buildings is properly charged against the ordinary allowance?—Yes, I think so. The Committee are on the spot and should do the work.
429. Do you not think it should be met out of the building grant?—Yes.
430. Ordinary repairs also out of the building grant?—Yes; but then there is the difficulty of allocating the grant. The Committee would need to return an account to the Board.
431. Do not the returns of Committees' allowances allow for such discrimination?—I assume so.
432. In that case would there be any great difficulty in refunding the amount they give for small repairs?—It could be done.
433. Of the expenditure of £1,972 we would have to take what has been spent on buildings for repairs: have you any idea of the proportion that would be of the allowance of 7s. 10d. a head?—No.
434. Still, there is a possible sum there that might reduce the whole amount?—Yes.
435. Supposing you gave a sum of £500 instead of £250, the amount of capitation would be hardly increased, and you would get an increase of £250: would that not go towards meeting the difficulty?—Yes.
436. With regard to the staffing of the schools in Nelson itself, can you tell me what is the highest salary paid to a male teacher?—£300.
437. What is the salary paid in a school of 960 under the proposed scale?—£382.
438. Is there a residence in addition to the £300 you state?—No.
439. If the Board gave house allowance besides, by any special means afforded it, you would assess that at about £50 or £60 extra?—Yes.
440. What is the salary of the next highest male teacher?—£200.
441. Under the scale what would it be?—£250.
442. The third under your scale?—£185.
443. Under the suggested scale?—£180.
444. The fourth under your scale?—£120.
445. Under this scale?—£140.
446. You have not compared the two?—No.
447. With regard to female assistants, what is the salary of your highest-paid female teacher?—£180.
448. What would she receive under the suggested scale?—£200.
449. What does your next female teacher receive?—£175.
450. On this scale?—£200.
451. An increase of £25?—Yes.
452. And so on all the way down?—Yes.
453. My object is to show that there is only one teacher who would lose £5 a year; that others would gain appreciably: there would be no lowering of the teachers' salaries in the Nelson District?—No.
454. You say you are of opinion that assistance should be given when a school has passed 30: speaking of mixed schools, with all standards, including infants, you think it is desirable to get assistance when the number passes 30?—Yes.

455. What form do you think the assistance should take?—A capable assistant teacher. We have to adopt the pupil-teacher system largely on account of economy.

456. Otherwise, apart from the view of economy, you do not see that it is an advantage in putting in a pupil-teacher?—There is one advantage—the grading is less abrupt.

457. Do you think that a pupil-teacher in a school is to some extent a source of weakness?—We have not, as a rule, found that so; they are better trained if they can begin in larger schools.

458. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you ever compared the amounts per head paid in the different districts for incidental expenses of schools?—No.

459. Have you ever compared the salaries paid to teachers in the Wanganui district with those paid to the teachers in Nelson?—No.

460. Would you be surprised to learn that the capitation allowance to School Committees in Nelson is twice that paid in Wanganui?—I am not at all surprised.

461. Is it your opinion that the amount paid to School Committees in this district is too high?—As a rule; I do not say in all cases. Our scale is graded—from 5s. 6d. a head in the case of large schools to 11s. 6d. in the case of small ones; average for the whole, 7s. 10d.

462. The average cost for School Committees per head is higher in Nelson than anywhere else?—Yes.

463. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you think, from your experience, that it is possible to amalgamate any of the education districts and extend the functions of secretaries?—Yes, I think it possible.

464. Do you think the same thing might be done in the matter of inspection? Suppose, for instance, we amalgamated—I do not say we would—Marlborough and Nelson—could one secretary perform the joint functions, do you think?—I think it would be possible; but not to reduce the number of Inspectors.

465. Do you think it would be advisable to periodically, or, say, once in seven years, exchange Inspectors between districts, or to exchange secretaries, say, between Canterbury and Otago, and *vce versâ*?—I have never considered the question of the exchange of secretaries.

466. You would not like to give an opinion upon it, perhaps?—No.

467. Failing the question for an exchange of secretaries, would you consider it proper to put the Inspectors under central authority?—I think there is much to be said on both sides of the question; but I do not think it is a question you should ask me.

468. It is held that, through secretaries remaining too long in their respective districts, teachers may not receive the treatment and fair-play they should do: what is your opinion?—It is a phase of the education question that has never come before me.

L. D. Easton, representing the Nelson Branch of the Educational Institute, Lower Moutere.

Mr. Easton: I might say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that I appear on behalf of the country teachers. The list of recommendations has been handed in by Mr. Gibbes. I would like to refer to the second and third recommendations. I think it is the second which says that a teacher's salary for the whole of each year should be calculated upon the average of the previous year, but that, in the event of a sudden and considerable change in the number of scholars, the Board, or the Minister, be empowered to make the necessary changes in staff and salaries. Now, sir, a proposal was made by the teachers to submit to you that the payment of salaries should not, as at present, fluctuate from quarter to quarter, but that at the beginning of the year the salary for the whole of the ensuing year should be fixed according to the average of the preceding year. That is done in the other colonies where there are systems of education administered from the Central Department, and it would be much more satisfactory, the teachers think, if they knew at the beginning of the year the salaries they were going to receive for the whole of the year. In regard to the next recommendation on the list (No. 3), there may be considerable difference of opinion in certain parts of the Nelson Educational District. As you are aware, in the Nelson District there are large quantities of fruit and hops grown—in New Zealand altogether there are about 1,050 acres, and in Nelson about 1,000 of these. I tried to ascertain what was the acreage under raspberries, but have not been able to do so. I know from my own experience that there is a very large acreage. The fruit-picking begins before Christmas. There is the raspberry- and the blackberry-picking, and then the hop-picking; and in consequence of this the schools are affected from before Christmas until the first week in April. The presence of the children in the gardens is absolutely necessary. The cultivation of the raspberries could not be carried on unless it were with the assistance of the children in the matter of picking; and the teachers think it a very great hardship that they should be, to a certain extent, punished in the matter of a reduction of salary owing to the enforced absence of children from the schools. The teachers are at the school ready and willing to do their work, and only too anxious that the children should come. As the representative of the teachers, I have to ask that your Commission, in the calculation of the average upon which the payment of salaries might be based, will take this question into consideration: that in any school which was largely affected by the fruit-growing and the hop-growing industries the attendances for the first quarter of the year should be omitted from the calculation of the average of those schools. The fact of the school being adversely affected by these circumetances might be certified to by the Education Board. In submitting this to the Commission we feel that we are not asking anything that is unreasonable. Another matter that I have to lay before you is with reference to the proposal, under this colonial scale of staff and salaries, in connection with certificates. There is no provision for accepting certificates of equal rank. For instance, in the schools of from 35 to 75 it says that a certificate of D2 is required by the headmaster. The teachers think that an E1, which by the department's regulation is held to be of equal rank with the D2, should be accepted, and that the salary attaching to an E1 certificate should not be subject to the deduction of 1 per cent. In the certificate regulations of the department there are nine ranks of certificates, but the teachers seem to be of opinion that under this proposed colonial scale the classes are separated too completely, and that there is no acknowledgment made as to the value of the rank of the certificate such as there is in the department's regulations.

469. *Mr. Davidson.*] What time of the year, Mr. Easton, did you say the hop-picking took place?—From about the 10th or 12th February this year, and continued until the end of the first week in April.

470. Do you know of any provision that is made in other countries where hop-growing is one of the principal industries, say, the eastern part of Victoria, in the Gippsland district, where a few special days are set apart for the picking of hops, which period is known as "hop holidays"? Do you think if such an arrangement obtained here that it would overcome the difficulty?—Possibly. We take our holidays during March, so as to obviate as far as possible the evil inflicted by the hop-picking. Both before and after the holidays we are affected by bad attendance.

471. *The Chairman.*] You find the period set apart for fruit- and hop-picking is too great?—Yes; it affects the attendance in my school very much; the average for last quarter was only 51 per cent. of the roll-number.

472. *Mr. Stewart.*] Does the dairying industry interfere with school-work?—No.

473. With regard to certificates, do you not think that the whole of your difficulties would be met by a simplification of the present system of certificates?—Yes; I think, myself, the present system of certificates is much too involved.

474. Do you think it is understood by School Committees and others who have the power of appointment?—I do not think they understand much about it. From my experience I should say that they know nothing of the relative value of certificates.

475. Do you think it would be better to grant an absolute teaching-certificate in one or two grades, and then allow the pass degree to stand as an extra qualification?—I think you should have certificates showing high literary attainments as well as high technical skill.

476. Would not the B.A. degree show that?—Yes.

477. Suppose a man passes the B.A. Examination and he has the figure "1" on his certificate, he becomes a B1?—Yes.

478. Does that enhance his qualifications: is the B1 of any help to him? Or do you think the present system of certificates too elaborate?—Yes, I do.

479. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you not think that the difficulty in fluctuating attendance might be overcome by the hop-picking being looked upon as a technical training, and a certain number of days set apart for the children for that purpose?—No; raspberry-, blackberry-, and hop-picking extend over three months.

480. But could not a certain number of days be set aside for this purpose as technical training for the children?—Yes, if the Government would allow attendance in the fruit-gardens to count as attendance at school.

481. Which do you think the most important in the case of teachers, technical skill or academic status?—Technical skill, undoubtedly.

482. Which do you think in the estimation of Committees and Education Boards receives the most consideration in the classification of teachers, skill or academic status?—I should say academic status, as shown by the higher letter held.

483. Supposing the Education Department was to issue a certificate perfectly separate from the university status and make it as difficult for a university man to get a certificate as it is for an ordinary individual—that is, the technical man—do you think that would not be a better way of treating the academic man? Do you think that a certificate issued by the Education Department separate from the present arrangements would be the better one in place of the present arrangements?—If the department were to tabulate the subjects, then the applicant for a certificate should be required to pass in those subjects.

484. You mean that a man possessing academic status should be required to pass subjects equally with the other?—Yes.

485. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] What is your average attendance at the present time?—About 50, I think.

486. What salary are you receiving?—£145.

487. Under the new system of classification what salary would you receive?—£159.

488. Do you consider that this proposed scale would be an improvement on the state of affairs existing in Nelson at the present time?—Yes.

489. Have you had much experience in schools of this size?—Yes.

490. How many pupils do you consider a sole teacher can efficiently manage in a country school?—It would depend on the number of classes he would have.

491. Take the average country school up to the Fffth Standard, including the Fifth Standard?—If he had no higher standard than the Fifth, I should say 35 to 40.

492. Do the teachers experience any hardship in this district owing to the want of house accommodation or allowance?—No.

493. The salaries we see in your report are in addition to house allowance or residences?—Yes.

494. With regard to Inspectors and the question of marks: you know that there is a lack of uniformity in the assignment of Inspector's marks?—Yes, I believe so.

495. Have you had any experience or suffered an injustice in that direction, and have you known any teachers in your Institute who have met with that difficulty?—No.

496. Will assistant teachers be assigned the figure E1 or D1 without requiring to go into a country school to teach?—*e.g.*, some Inspectors make a rule that assistant teachers shall not rise to the figure "1": supposing a teacher may have a D2, he must remain at that. Does that state of things obtain here?—I did not know there was any regulation to that effect.

497. *Mr. Hogben.*] With regard to your opinion on the subject of certificates: you are aware that any one requiring a certificate for C, D, or E must pass an examination in certain subjects, *quasi*-professional, outside the other (literary) subjects. Do you think he should be exempt in school method?—No.

498. Then, your opinion is practically confined to that?—A graduate should show technical skill for his certificate.

499. I am referring to the examination now: you are aware that the examinations require from him technical skill?—Yes.

500. He cannot get a certificate until the Inspector has assigned him marks?—Yes.

501. You are aware that he cannot obtain a certificate unless he has had two years' experience in teaching?—Yes.

502. You are aware that the conditions for him are exactly the same as for any one else—that technical skill is wanted from him and experience?—Yes.

503. You expressed an opinion as to the number of pupils a teacher can take?—Yes.

504. The question was put in the form of how many pupils up to Standard V.: what would your opinion be if it included pupils up to Standard VII.?—I should say from 25 to 30.

505. What is the best form which you think assistance should take in a school that has passed the limit at which there is only one teacher employed?—An assistant, if it can be managed. I very strongly hold the opinion that a pupil-teacher should not be appointed to a school of—I should be inclined to go as far as 100 in attendance.

506. Then, you give that opinion because you are aware of some element of weakness in the staffing of the school which might be occasioned—I do not say would be occasioned—when a pupil-teacher is introduced into the school?—Yes.

507. A pupil-teacher requires a certain amount of supervision from the headmaster?—Yes.

508. That is to some extent a certain set-off against the assistance he receives?—Yes.

509. *The Chairman.*] You say you have an attendance of 50 at your school?—Yes.

510. What assistance have you?—A pupil-teacher.

511. How many standards do you teach yourself?—Standards III., IV., V., VI., and VII. I might say, with regard to the weakness of a pupil-teacher, that I have just got a new pupil-teacher. I have two rooms in my school, and this fresh, raw teacher has to go into one room and take charge of Standards I. and II. and the P. Class.

512. *Mr. Hill.*] Without any supervision?—Yes, except for a few moments.

513. *Mr. Stewart.*] Is it the practice of your Board to send raw pupil-teachers to the schools of the character of the one you have?—By a raw pupil-teacher I mean a pupil-teacher who has had no experience.

514. Then, you mean a first-year pupil-teacher?—Yes.

515. *The Chairman.*] I suppose you find the labour attending to the teaching of those standards you enumerated very arduous?—Yes.

516. Do you think if you held a position as first or second assistant in one of the larger schools of New Zealand that your task would be any heavier than it is at the present time?—No, I am sure it would not be.

517. I mean assuming you had only one standard to teach?—If such were the case my work would be a great deal lighter than now.

518. Is there any opportunity in a district like this for promotion?—No; there are very few large schools, and what large schools there are are down the West Coast, where a good many of the teachers would not care to go.

Rev. J. P. KEMPTHORNE, Chairman of the Nelson School Committee, examined.

Rev. Mr. Kempthorne: I may say I think the suggested scale of staff and salaries a step in the right direction; and I shall be pleased to answer any questions that may be put to me to the best of my ability.

519. *The Chairman.*] You have looked into the suggested scale?—Yes, I have; and I think it is a very great improvement on what obtains at present. I do not think it will in any sense lessen the expense in the working of schools, so far as I can see; but at the same time I do not think it will increase the expense.

520. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you think it necessary that the schools in Nelson should be so subdivided as they are at present?—Well, the schools as at present here have simply grown into that position. Apparently the Board, as need arose, established a small school here and there. We inherit many of our schools from the old Education Board, and they had not, or perhaps I should say they may not have had, the money, or, if they had, did not think fit to alter the system; and so from the first we have had no opportunity to organize them better. I think it would be a good thing if the schools were amalgamated into one or two; not that I think it would be an economy to do so, but it would be more efficient and up to date.

521. *Mr. Davidson.*] You have a very extensive knowledge of the Nelson Education District?—Yes, I have.

522. You have travelled all through it?—Yes.

523. I find, in the published return from the Minister of Education, that there are forty-two schools in this district with an average attendance under 15, or more than a third of the total number of schools in the district—*i.e.*, 123: in your opinion, do you think that number of schools necessary?—No, I do not think so.

524. Do you think if a system of conveyance for bringing the children to a central district school were adopted it might be carried out in the Nelson Education District to advantage?—Yes, I think a scheme of that kind would be a very good thing.

525. If some arrangement of that kind were made and children were to be on the ground ready at, say, 8.45 a.m., in your opinion it would tend to great regularity?—Yes.

526. Also punctuality?—Yes.

527. Together they would be a very important influence in the training of children?—Yes.

528. Do you think that the teaching in a central-district school would be more efficient than in a number of small schools?—Very much more efficient.

529. Would it be more economical?—That I cannot say; I do not think in our own town schools it would be.

530. I mean in the outlying districts: for instance, if you had a district with a long valley and a fairly good road running throught it, instead of having five or six schools, if you had one central school, well equipped and up to date, and the children conveyed to it, would it not be very desirable and more economical?—Yes, it would.

531. What is your opinion as to placing Inspectors under the control of the Central Department?—I have no opinion on the matter.

532. *Mr. Stewart.*] I wish to ask one or two questions as to the staffing of your side-schools at the present time: can you kindly tell me the number of pupil-teachers in your side-schools?—We have one side-school—the Tasman Street School. I cannot give you the number of scholars attending the school, though I think the average for 1900 was 126. The staffing is a head-teacher and three pupil-teachers. There are two rooms, the second room being in charge of the third-year pupil-teacher.

533. What is your opinion as to the advisableness or otherwise of such an arrangement as that?—I think the head-teacher deserves an assistant; the work of supervising and teaching is too much. I think it is expecting too much of a third-year pupil-teacher to take charge of the room.

534. Did your Committee make any representation to the Board in the matter?—We did so when the school started. I believe the wish of the Board, or the Inspector, was to have a school in which a third-year pupil-teacher might gain experience in taking charge of a room alone.

535. Do you know anything of the circumstances of the Haven Road School?—Yes; there is a headmistress, an assistant, and three pupil-teachers.

536. The average attendance is somewhere about 150, is it not?—I believe it is 166. The infant-room with about 90 children is in charge of a pupil-teacher.

537. Is there any other teacher in the room besides the pupil-teacher?—I think there are two pupil-teachers.

538. Practically, the room is managed by the three pupil-teachers, is it not?—No; only the two; the other is with the headmistress.

539. Then, two pupil-teachers have charge of the 90 children?—Yes; that is, children below the First Standard.

540. In reference to the trend of modern education, do you think it would be advisable to take elementary technical work in all the schools?—No; it would be impossible.

541. You think that to have elementary technical training it would be necessary to have the schools combined?—Yes; we do a little kindergarten work.

542. With regard to the amount of strain or otherwise entailed in teaching a school of, say, 46 with all standards, and two teachers, and the management of a large class, have any facts come under the notice of your Committee which would lead you to form any opinion as to the amount of strain involved?—We had one case of a young lady who had been an assistant in a country school and who had applied to come to Nelson; we appointed her a pupil-teacher here, and she thought she was going to have a comparatively easy time, but, on the contrary, she found the work very much harder than she had been accustomed to.

543. Do you think the children in country schools are more difficult to manage than the children in town schools?—I think the children in town schools more difficult to manage.

544. Do you know anything of the conditions of teaching in country schools at all?—Yes.

545. Upon all grounds, you, as Chairman of the Committee, are in favour of establishing one or two schools in place of the number you have at present—that is to say, you are in favour of combination?—Yes.

546. On the grounds of efficiency, mainly?—Yes.

547. *Mr. Luke.*] Is there only one School Committee in the Town of Nelson?—Yes.

548. You believe that it would be advisable in the case of Nelson and Richmond that the boys and girls should work together in one school?—Yes.

549. *Mr. Hill.*] Is it the general opinion of your Committee that the schools should be merged?—I cannot say; we never discussed the question. In conjunction with Mr. McKenzie, I appear before you as an individual, not as representing the Committee.

550. You have found up to the present time that the plan of separation works fairly well?—Yes.

551. Have you heard any wish that they should be merged?—I think it is a necessity; I think the Committee would be in favour of it.

552. Has there been any application made to the Education Board to that effect, so far as you are aware?—No.

553. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] I understand you are of opinion that there are too many small country schools?—Yes.

554. Could the children of the settlers in back-country districts get education without so many of those schools?—I do not see that they could, unless there was some means of conveying the children to a centrally situated school.

555. Do you think it is better to build schools than to convey the children as you suggest?—I think pressure has been brought to bear on Boards by the country settlers for the establishment of so many of these schools. When representations are made to the Board for a school they are mostly from country settlers.

556. You think the children in the back country should get education?—Certainly.

557. So far as the question of conveying the children is concerned, do you not think it would be more expensive, and, moreover, do you not think that at times it would be impossible, to convey them on account of bad roads and other causes?—Yes.

558. You are aware that in some districts it is not only the question of roads that has to be considered, but there may be a mountain or a river that it is impossible to cross?—Yes, I recognise the great difficulties in the way.

559. *Mr. Hogben.*] You are acquainted with the circumstances that affect the cost of living of people in the country districts round Nelson, are you not?—Yes.

560. Are you acquainted with similar circumstances in other parts of the colony?—No, I am not. I have lived for some years in the Nelson District.

561. Is the cost of living, as far as you are aware of the facts in the Nelson District, higher than in other parts of the colony?—Yes.

562. Within the Nelson District does the cost of living vary very considerably in one part from another?—Yes; on the coast it is somewhat higher.

563. Do you think it would be possible to adjust any scale of salaries by taking these facts into consideration?—I hardly think that is a sufficient ground to make any difference in the salaries.

564. Has it been proposed to make any difference in the Nelson District?—No.

565. You say you have been living here for some time?—Yes.

566. Can you form any idea as to the value of board and lodging in an ordinary country settler's house: take the case of a teacher in a household school, for instance?—I should say about £30 would be fair; 10s. or 12s. a week.

567. If you took the holidays into consideration it would hardly amount to £30 a year, would it?—No.

568. Then, £30 a year would be the outside amount?—Yes.

569. Would you have any objection to the transfer of a teacher from one district to another in order to bring into operation a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—No, certainly not.

570. Do you think your Committee would raise any objections?—No, I think not; that is, if the teacher was considered and would suffer no loss.

571. If the Board acted to its utmost discretion there would be no objection, would there?—No.

572. And, of course, you understand the Board would try to avoid any loss on the part of the teacher?—Yes.

573. You expressed an opinion—I hardly think you meant it—with regard to elementary technical work in a small primary school: you draw a distinction between manual instruction and technical work, I presume?—Yes.

574. Technical instruction has for its object training for one or more trades, has it not?—Yes.

575. Then, your answer—*i.e.*, that it was impossible to do elementary technical work in small schools—would not apply to manual instruction?—No.

576. It would only apply to the technical subjects taken, or suggested to be taken, in a small school?—Yes.

577. Could you name one of the subjects?—Woodwork, carpentry.

578. You think it would be impossible to teach woodwork in a small school?—Yes, with the present staff.

579. Do you think it would be impossible to teach clay-modelling or plasticine-modelling?—No; I think that could be taught; it is being done in small schools now.

580. And cardboard-modelling?—Yes.

581. Would that work be more difficult than elementary science?—No.

582. It would be all the easier to teach those subjects if the present syllabus was lightened for small schools?—Yes.

583. If that were the case you would not see any difficulty in carrying out the Manual and Technical Instruction Act in the small schools?—No.

584. *The Chairman.*] You say it is perfectly feasible to carry out manual and technical work?—Yes; it is done in our schools.

585. There are six schools under the control of your Committee?—Yes.

586. You have a Boys' Central School?—Yes.

587. A Girls' Central?—Yes; the Toitoi School.

588. The other four are side-schools?—Yes; four mixed infant-schools, working up to the Second Standard.

589. Is the instruction given in the Girls' School—the Toitoi School—equal in efficiency to that given in the Boys' Central School?—Yes, I think so; they have an excellent staff of teachers there. The situation of the school is very bad, and on that account we lose a lot of pupils in the winter-time. We applied for a new site—for the site of the old gaol—so that we could get the school removed, but we were refused the site. The Minister of Education visited that school with me upon one occasion, and he was strongly of the opinion that the site was a very bad one indeed. We applied for the new site thinking it would be greatly in the interests of education and in the interests of the girls attending the school. The school is right up against the hill; very little sunlight getting at it, and in the winter the children are nearly perished with the cold.

590. Then, on account of its situation the school is being worked under serious disadvantages?—Yes; and we lose a good many children; they go to private schools.

591. What is your opinion as to the efficiency of the staff and the character of the education given?—It is first class.

592. Do you think the school holds its own against the Boys' School?—I do.

593. The teachers in each school are equally competent?—Yes, I think so; fairly so. Of course, there is an advantage in having a man at the head of the school; under many circumstances, I think a male better than a female.

594. Do you think it would be an improvement if there was a master at the head of the Toitoi School?—We are quite satisfied with our present headmistress. It is only my opinion, gene-

rally speaking, that a master is in many respects to be preferred, principally on account of the control he exercises.

595. He has more influence, you think?—Yes; a stronger hand, and more moral influence and force over children.

596. If the boys and girls occupied a combined school, similar to the infant-schools you have, do you think it would be a disadvantage?—I rather prefer the present arrangement for the girls as they grow up from the Third Standard and upwards.

597. I ask those questions as I see the number of boys receiving education in the Central School is about the same as the number of girls in the Toitoi School, is it not?—I think there are rather more girls than boys.

598. On the other hand, the cost of staffing in the Central School is about double. I assume that is owing to the smaller salaries paid to the female teachers?—Yes. The headmaster of the Boys' Central School receives £330 a year, and the headmistress of the Toitoi School £175, and the others in proportion.

599. And yet you say the efficiency is equal?—Yes. I think our returns show that, as far as one can judge from examinations.

600. Are you acquainted with the aided schools?—I do not know much about them.

601. If the assistance that is now rendered to the household schools, or aided schools, was withheld, are you of the opinion that the children would not be educated?—I am afraid so.

602. Do you think the settlers would be unable to find governesses or tutors, or to send their children to places where they would receive education?—A proportion of them would not be educated at all.

603. Then, you think that at least some of them would be unable to send their children to other schools, or provide means for their education?—Yes.

604. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You approve of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

605. You consider that it would be a marked improvement in an educational district such as this?—Yes.

606. You think that without a colonial scale of staff and salaries the extra capitation of 5s. would not make any material improvement in the salaries of the teachers in the Nelson District, seeing that with a £3 15s. capitation grant now you receive £17,500 odd, and a £4 capitation grant would mean only £1,100 more: it would not make any material difference, you think?—I think it would, some difference at all events.

607. Would it not make a considerable difference under a colonial scale, where instead of getting an extra 5s. you might get £1 5s., seeing that some of the Boards would not get 5s. as they do not require it?—Yes, of course it would.

608. With regard to the appointment of teachers, are the names of certificated applicants sent to your Committee?—Yes.

609. And does the Board usually act on the recommendations of the Committee?—Yes.

610. Your Committee would be in favour of the removal or transfer of teachers if it was practicable, and for the benefit of the Committee and teachers alike?—Yes.

611. I suppose your Committee has had no experience with regard to the exchange of teachers?—I do not think so.

612. As to the cost of living, is it not a fact that the cost of living will vary in every educational district as well as Nelson, between town and country?—Yes.

613. Do you consider it possible that we could have a dual scale for districts where the cost of living varies?—Yes.

614. Did the Nelson Board ever try that?—I cannot say.

615. With regard to house allowance and buildings: I hear that in the majority of cases residences are provided for the teachers?—Not in town.

616. You give them an increased salary in the town on that account, do you?—I do not know; I do not think so.

617. Do you give them house allowance?—No.

618. I understand the Committee get a very liberal allowance from the Education Board for the purpose of repairing buildings?—Not so very liberal, so far as I am aware.

619. Not as liberal as you would like?—No, though we manage to make both ends meet. For anything we require we apply to the Board if the cost is over £5.

620. When teachers from other districts apply for situations, do you place them on the same footing as your own teachers: for example, you do not boycott them?—No; on the same footing.

621. Are there many from other districts who get appointments here?—Yes.

622. Do you know of any teachers from this district who applied for positions in other districts and were refused on account of their being outsiders?—No.

623. Do you consider a male teacher should have preference to a female in the larger schools?—I was speaking more of headmasters than subordinate teachers.

624. Do you consider a female teacher equally efficient to a male teacher in a small country school where the circumstances are not such as would necessitate the appointment of a male teacher: would not the female be quite as efficient to take a number up to, say, 30 or 40?—I think, all things being equal, a male teacher is to be preferred to the female.

625. Is it not the case that your Committee discourages the appointment of male teachers?—No.

626. I find that your teachers in the town schools are for the most part females, is that not so?—Yes; in the four young schools—the side-schools—that is so. In the case of these schools—infant-schools—perhaps a female may be better to look after the little ones.

627. With regard to pupil-teachers, does your Committee favour or discourage the appointment of male pupil-teachers, or are they indifferent?—We encourage male pupil-teachers when we get any applicants.

628. You do not know if it is the custom in country schools to discourage males, and encourage females, in order that they may teach sewing?—No, I have not heard so.

629. Do you consider that we should adopt the principle of equal pay and equal work with regard to the salaries of male and female teachers? Take a school of 30: if a female can teach that school as efficiently as a male, should she not receive the same remuneration?—I think that in the lower positions you might give the same salary. In the higher positions, I think, there are other reasons that would preclude an equal salary.

630. Has your Committee any guiding principle in regard to the recommendation of teachers for appointments, as far as their certificates are concerned: is it the rule or is it the exception that those who hold the higher certificates get the appointment?—The higher certificate would, of course, influence the Committee in deciding who should get the appointment. Of course, there are other things as well as scholastic attainments to be considered in choosing a teacher.

Rev. J. H. MacKenzie, Member of the Nelson School Committee.

Rev. Mr. MacKenzie: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I sympathize in the main with all that has been said by Mr. Kempthorne in regard to the conditions and the staffing of the schools. With regard to the number of pupil-teachers we have employed, I think there are too many—the Committee thinks so too—and we have applied to the Board for assistants; but owing to the lack of funds we are obliged to have pupil-teachers. The Board has been told that it is simply sweating to employ a girl for £30 a year when they should at least pay £80. With regard to what has been said in reference to the amalgamation of schools, I would like to emphasize the fact that the Toitoi School is better known as the Girls' Central School, for people outside of Nelson imagine that it is some ten miles away from the town. Two years ago we made as strong an appeal as we possibly could to the Government for the site of the disused gaol, with the conviction that we would get it too, for the medical profession have all condemned the present site of the school as unhealthy and unfit for the purpose for which it is used, but we are still as far from getting it as ever. We have applied more than once to the Board to make the change, and the last reply we received was that they would keep the matter steadily in view, keep it before them, and—it is a good way before them yet, as far as I can see. It is the opinion of the Committee that this is a most important matter for Nelson at the present time in things educational.

631. *The Chairman.*] Is the site available: is it the property of the Government?—Yes, it is the property of the Government; and we have good reason to believe that we should have got the site if the Board had said that as soon as possible they would remove the school. I would suggest to the Commission that anything definite in regard to the amalgamation of the different schools should involve the removal of this school from its present unhealthy site, for I think that is one very strong point which would lead the Committee to sympathize with the proposal for the amalgamation of the schools. A good many of the children have to attend private schools, for on account of their delicate health they are unable to go to Toitoi School; and I was told, only two days ago, that on account of the unhealthy situation of the latter school between 30 and 40 children were lost to us. In regard to the abolishing of country schools, or, rather, merging them into a central school, might I suggest it would have to be done under compulsion, under orders from the Government? The Boards could scarcely carry it out owing to their peculiar position, elected as they are by the different Committees. Mr. Kempthorne has spoken with regard to how Committees may feel with reference to transferring teachers. We have had some experience on that point, and we maintain that we should be consulted in the matter of transfer. We had to take legal opinion on the matter, and we were advised by the highest legal authority that the consultation required in the Act is a reality and not a sham. All the facts that would lead the Board to a decision must be put before the Committee concerned. The Nelson Board sends us all applications from certificated teachers, and it would be better if the appointments were simply in the hands of the Board or the Committee. As to the cost of living, I have lived in Southland, Canterbury, and Nelson, and I know that it is much more expensive to live in Nelson. One other point that would lead us to favour the amalgamation of schools: frequently children are passed from the Second Standard into the Third when they are not equal to the requirements of the Third Standard, and if the schools were all gathered together under a head-teacher he would be able to judge as to whether they were fit for the promotion or otherwise.

632. *Mr. Davidson.*] Is the gaol-site still available?—Yes.

633. You are of opinion that the chief difficulty in the matter of centralising the schools, doing away with a large number of the present small ones, is the objection of the Committee?—I think so, and in getting the Boards to act unless under orders.

634. I understand you are of the opinion that frequently the pressure brought to bear by Committees is so great that Education Boards cannot resist it?—Yes, I believe so.

635. Many of the education evils, you will probably admit, are due to the methods of electing Education Boards?—Yes.

636. *Mr. Stewart.*] With regard to the Toitoi Valley School, one side of the question you have spoken upon is the healthiness or otherwise of the situation: let me ask you, is the site a central one?—It is the very opposite.

637. Then, as a matter of fact, I may take it that a very large proportion of the girls who attend that school have a much greater distance to go than they would have if any amalgamation were brought about?—Yes, that is so. There are a few coming from The Port; but you cannot take The Port into consideration when you think of the Town of Nelson.

638. You think that the majority have to be considered?—Yes.

639. I think you said that about 40 pupils were lost in consequence of the unhealthy state of the Toitoi Valley School?—Between 30 and 40.

640. At the capitation grant of £4 that would mean a loss of £160 to the Board?—Yes. Perhaps a number of the children go to the private schools for other reasons; but I know of at

least four or five families where the parents would not allow the children to go to the Toitoi School on account of the unhealthiness of the site.

641. Practically, there is a great loss of income to the Board on that account?—Yes.

642. A hundred and sixty pounds would go considerably towards bringing about this amalgamation?—Yes.

643. I mean it would represent the interest of a very considerable sum that would go towards bringing an amalgamation about?—Yes.

644. You said something about the peculiar position of members of Boards: I assume that refers to what Mr. Davidson spoke of, as to the method of election?—Yes; the Commission are aware of the way in which members are elected. Under the present arrangement two of these small schools have as much influence as we have in Nelson; in fact, one of these small schools has as much to say as the six schools in Nelson, with their 1,000 children.

645. You do not think that is in the interests of education?—No.

646. *Mr. Luke.*] Are there many private schools in Nelson?—There is established one private denominational school; other than that I think there are two small infant schools.

647. *Mr. Hill.*] What is the greatest distance the girls have to go to the Central School?—Some have to come from the far side of "the Wood."

648. How far is that?—About two miles and a half.

649. Is the site which you propose a more central one than the one you have at present?—Yes; it is in the very centre of the town.

650. How long has the present Girls' School been built?—I believe about twenty-two years.

651. Is it a wooden building?—Yes.

652. I notice you have female teachers in the Boys' School: has any proposal ever been made to have male teachers in the Girls' School?—We have only had female pupil-teachers in the Boys' School since February. Female pupil-teachers find a difficulty in managing boys in the country schools. It was arranged that two female teachers should be in the Boys' Central School.

653. I understood you to say that your Committee is of the opinion that you have too many pupil-teachers at work?—Yes, we have.

654. I suppose you appoint pupil-teachers to your schools who have passed Standard VI.?—Yes.

655. Have they had any previous training for the position of pupil-teacher, do you know?—None whatever.

656. Then, they are placed in charge of a class?—Yes; they are so placed that, in my opinion, they are in charge.

657. Do you think that a plan is possible whereby some arrangements could be made for the training of young people before being sent to take charge of a class—as, for example, taking matriculated pupils who are desirous of becoming teachers and giving them twelve months' training beforehand?—Yes; I do not think the present plan is a very happy one, and I do not think it is good for the children. In the Hampden Street School there is a teacher and one pupil-teacher, with an average attendance of 94.

658. Then, you are of opinion that a school with a mistress and one pupil-teacher, with an average attendance of 94, is greatly understaffed?—Yes.

659. Do the female teachers in your schools hold certificates of the same grade as the males?—Speaking from memory, I do not think they are quite so high.

660. Do you require from them as much work?—That is really a matter for the Inspectors.

661. They have the same number of pupils to teach as the males?—Yes, I think they have. Of course, the numbers vary, but they are expected to do the same work.

662. They do not receive the same salaries, of course?—No.

663. Do you think they deserve the same salaries—that is, if they do the same work?—Yes, I think so.

664. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] By what process of evolution does it come to pass that you have only one Committee for all these town schools?—Well, in Nelson we live very much on tradition; it has been the position from the beginning. The separation of the boys and girls I never saw until I came here, and I have often pointed out the loss upon it.

665. Especially in the election of members of the Board?—Yes.

666. In regard to the question of a dual scale of salaries in districts where the cost of living varies, do you think that is necessary?—If the salaries are fair all round I think it is unnecessary.

667. In Nelson, supposing the cost of living is not so high as round the Coast districts, would you not require to differentiate between the salaries?—That might be necessary.

668. With regard to consulting Committees, you consider that Boards are legally bound to consult the Committees: you say the Act says so?—Yes.

669. Supposing they do not abide by the recommendation of the Committee—they are not bound to do so—what then?—I have been on one or two Committees, and I have seen the Boards beaten.

670. How many pupils do you consider that a teacher unaided can efficiently teach in a small country school?—I have no experience in regard to that.

671. In the Toitoi Valley School they are all female teachers, are they not?—Yes.

672. Are there any male teachers in the Haven Road School?—Yes; one.

673. Any male teachers in Hampden Street?—Yes.

674. Is there a male teacher in Tasman Street School?—Yes, but he is away on the sick-list.

675. Any male teachers in Brook Street School?—No.

676. Then, in the Nelson schools the greater proportion of teachers are females?—Yes, because the males do not apply.

677. Is it a fact that the Committees encourage females?—No; the very opposite is the case.

678. You do not know whether it is the case in the country schools or not?—No.

679. *Mr. Hogben.*] How do you compare the cost of living in Nelson with that of other districts you have lived in in New Zealand, especially in regard to food and clothing?—I know by the prices I have to pay in the shops here as compared with elsewhere that it is very much higher. I was ten years in Southland.

680. Is your acquaintance with those other places at all recent?—I have been nine years here.

681. And you have not renewed your acquaintance with those other places?—Not recently.

682. Does the cost vary greatly between different parts of the Nelson District and other places?—I have no experience in regard to that.

683. With regard to the site you want for the Girls' School, you say it is still available?—Yes, still in the hands of the Government.

684. You are aware that the Board made application to the Education Department—to the Minister of Education—to endeavour to get the site, or part of the site?—Yes, I think the Board went a certain length.

685. The application was made: do you know what answer was given to that application?—No.

686. Would you be surprised to hear that it was absolutely needed for the purposes of the Police Department, and that the Education Department did its best; but the Police Department represented its needs in such a way that the Education Department could not contradict them?—I have good reason to believe that if the Board had agreed to move the school we would have got the site.

687. With regard to the consultation of Committees in the matter of transfer of teachers, you think there would be no strong feeling if the Boards consulted the Committees in the full sense of legal requirements, and yet after that transferred the teachers contrary to the wishes of the Committees: do you think any serious objection would be taken?—I do not think so, if the Board consulted them properly.

688. You think there would be no serious trouble?—I do not think so.

689. In your opinion, the point is that the Committee should be properly consulted?—Yes.

690. *The Chairman.*] I understand you to mean that either the Board or the Committee should have the power to make transfers or payments, but you object to dual control?—Yes.

691. You had legal opinion on the subject to the effect that the Committees must be consulted?—Yes; it must be a reality, and not a sham.

692. Assuming that a Committee is consulted and is subsequently overruled, do you think there would be any illegality on the part of the Board?—No; it is quite legal, evidently.

693. You say that the site you wish for the Toitoi School is in the centre of the town, and has been used as a gaol-site?—Yes, many years.

694. How long has it been abandoned? Is there any gaol there now?—The buildings are there, but they are not used.

695. They are no longer required for that purpose, then?—A new building has been put up convenient to the police-station.

696. For what purpose?—A gaol.

697. Is it used as a gaol?—Yes; those who are to serve longer terms are taken to Wellington, I suppose.

698. In that case, do you think it is desirable to have a school alongside a gaol?—These buildings are far apart; the site is in the centre of the town, and in the sunniest part of the town.

699. Then, the site is not being used for any useful purpose now?—It is not being used at all.

700. You believe that if the question of the site for the establishment of the Girls' School had been urged by the Education Board properly the Government would have given in to popular pressure?—Yes, I believe so.

701. You do not think the present system of appointing pupil-teachers desirable?—I think that our experience in Nelson shows that it is not.

702. Is there any defined age, any limit at which pupil-teachers are appointed?—Yes; I think the age is fifteen.

703. Are they required to undergo any preparatory course before they are admitted to the schools as pupil-teachers?—Yes; there is an entrance examination. Candidates are expected to appear at this examination—that is, if they have not been attending examinations at the college, or lectures, and are thus equal to the preparatory or entrance examination.

704. Do you consider it is possible for all those young female pupil-teachers to properly attend to their duties in school and teach, as apparently some of them are doing, a considerable number of children, and at the same time prepare for their future examinations?—I do not think they can thoroughly.

705. A case was mentioned of a teacher who left one of your town schools and returned to the country school because she was worked too hard in town?—Yes.

706. Have you known cases where girls have broken down under the severe mental strain of having to attend to their school duties and prepare afterwards for their annual examinations?—We have had a good many break down in health.

707. Did they have to give up their employment?—I was trying to think. I know we had one or two cases.

708. Have you had any fatal cases where girls have broken down in health under the strain?—No, I think not.

709. Do you think that if pupil-teachers were better treated and better paid you would have applications from boys as well as girls?—Yes, I do.

710. You consider the payment of pupil-teachers inadequate to attract both sexes?—Yes.

711. What is your opinion as to the reason for girls applying, and not boys, for the positions?—I suppose the boys think they are able to do better elsewhere, for there are few applications.

712. The boys get more remunerative employment?—Yes, I think so.

713. Do many of the pupil-teachers or young teachers attached to the city schools seek situations in the country?—The tendency is to stay in town as far as possible. They live with their parents and other members of the family, and thus do not care about going into these out-of-the-way places.

714. Then, there is a difficulty in getting them to go into the country?—Yes.

715. On the other hand, is there any great difficulty in getting country teachers to apply for vacancies in the towns?—There is no great rush of country teachers to the town schools when there is an opening.

716. Not if there is a vacancy with a salary of £150 a year?—There are very few like that.

717. *Mr. Stewart.*] Has the Nelson Board ever had a dual scale—one for the Coast schools?—I think not.

WILLIAM F. WORLEY, Assistant Master, Boys' Central School.

Mr. Worley: I may say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have been very much interested in the question of a colonial scale of staff and salaries for many years. I have gone very carefully into the matter, and in all of them, this present suggested one included, I notice what I consider to be an error—that is, that assistant teachers are paid, or are proposed to be paid, according to the size of the school in which they are employed. In some cases, no doubt, that would work out fairly enough, say, in the smaller schools, where the assistant would take the lower classes. When, however, that school reached a certain size the first or second assistant would be doing exactly similar work to the work of an assistant in a larger school, but would receive very much less remuneration. The first assistant should be capable of taking charge—temporarily, at any rate—of the school in the absence of the headmaster, and I think assistant teachers doing the same work should receive the same salary. Under the proposed scale the first assistant in a school with an average attendance of 250 is to receive a salary of £150, but in a school of 600 he is paid £70 more—*i.e.*, £220—and the same thing applies to the assistants all through. Now, I think a better system would be to grade the assistants as first class, second class, and so on, according to the degree of examination passed, and length of service; then the larger schools would be entitled to two first assistants, a moderate-sized school would be entitled to one first-class assistant and one second-class, and so on according to the size of the school. I am also of the opinion that a limit should be put to the number of scholars an assistant teacher is expected to have charge of. At present the number varies considerably; sometimes we have had assistant teachers managing 90 pupils, with only a probationer to assist, and I think it is impossible for good work to be done under those conditions. Should a difficulty arise in doing as I suggest, then an increase to the staff would be necessary, even if it were only a temporary appointment. With regard to this suggested scale and the Nelson schools, the Nelson schools are isolated, and if the scale comes into operation as at present there are some of us who stand to suffer in the way of salary. If the teachers in the Boys' Central School were remunerated according to the scale, the first assistant would receive £150, the second assistant £100, and the others accordingly. The first assistant teaches the Sixth Standard and the second assistant the Fifth Standard, both of them doing exactly the same work as first and second assistants in schools in Wellington, Christchurch, or Dunedin, but who, by accident or otherwise, may be attached to a large school, and, by reason of that accident, be in receipt of a much larger salary. Then, again, if the Nelson schools were brought under the scale a difficulty would at once arise in connection with the side-schools. These side-schools are the feeders of the Central School, and if the salary is fixed according to the average attendance, after an examination, when a side-school sends up perhaps a draft of 30 pupils to the Central School, the salary of the teacher of the side-school would be greatly diminished, and teachers would suffer for the quality of their work; therefore it is obvious that it would be to the interests of the teachers in these side-schools not to send up more pupils than they could possibly help, and then only when absolutely compelled. If the whole of the town schools were amalgamated into one school, and the salaries paid according to the proposed scale, then many of the teachers in Nelson would benefit, and especially some of our underpaid lady teachers. We have a female teacher holding a C2 certificate, and another holding a D2, receiving £70 per annum. An amalgamation of the town schools, and these small side-schools as well, would total about 960 pupils, about the number at the Gloucester Street School in Christchurch. It is merely a geographical accident that we teachers in Nelson happen to be so split up and divided. If the object of the colonial scale is to administer justice all round, then it seems to me that consideration must be given to these facts. The total salaries of all the teachers in the Town of Nelson at present is something like £2,427, and according to the proposed scale they would total £2,552, an increase of £125. I should like to point out, in regard to the Toitoi Valley School, that the average attendance is 45 less than that of the Boys' Central; but at the census lately taken in Nelson the females are more numerous than the males. With regard to pupil-teachers, I have had pupil-teachers working under me—I have a son a pupil-teacher—and therefore I have special opportunities for noticing the strain upon them in doing their school-work and carrying on their own individual studies at the same time. I am strongly of opinion that the hours of labour of pupil-teachers should be at least shortened by one hour a day. I have a Fifth Standard class with about 70 pupils, and I make a point of giving my probationer at least one hour a day for himself. In some schools a pupil-teacher has to work the whole time, and carry on his studies as well, and I am absolutely certain that is too much. With regard to the removal or transfer of teachers, I have felt sometimes that I should like a change—a temporary change. I have been kept back by my inability to attend university lectures, and I have

been debarred from making the progress I might have made had there been possibilities open to me. If a colonial scale had been in operation, it might have been arranged that I could change places with a teacher in Auckland, Wellington, or Christchurch, as the case may be, and so have had facilities to pass on to a university degree; but, of course, I have not been able to do so, as there has been no opportuuity.

718. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you think it would be an improvement in the education of the children and the efficiency of the teaching, as far as the Nelson town schools are concerned, if there was an amalgamation brought about?—It is rather a difficult matter to say. As regards the efficiency of the teachers, I think that is quite satisfactory; but I think, on the whole, if there were amalgamation there would be a gain in efficiency.

719. *Mr. Davidson.*] You object to the arrangement of the salaries so far as male assistants are concerned?—Yes, for the reasons I pointed out just now.

720. If you take a school of from 570 to 600 you find the salary of the first male assistant £220; from 960 to 1,050, £250; and yet with the great increase in the number there is only an increase of £30 in salary: do you think the responsibility of what might be called the deputy headmaster is not worth more than an additional £30?—Yes; I mentioned that with regard to the first assistant; I quite recognise that he should be capable of taking charge of the whole school. With regard to the other assistants, I do not think it applies; I do not think the second assistant should receive as much.

721. Do you know of any district in New Zealand, or any district in the world for that matter, where such an arrangement as you suggest obtains?—No, I do not.

722. You say that you think there should be a limit to the number of pupils an assistant is required to teach: have you looked through the scale and struck an average of the number of children per teacher in the different grades of schools?—Yes, I have done that; but it frequently happens that the number in a class varies; a Fourth Standard class might be overloaded.

723. You have found in the analysis of the scale that the largest number of pupils any teacher should have is not more than 40?—Yes; striking the average, that is so, but it does not work out in practice. As I said, you may have one class overloaded, while the other classes may be very moderate ones.

724. You admit that is a fault in the arrangement of the staff?—One not easily remedied.

725. You pointed out the fact that the introduction of so many of the small schools would reduce the salaries in the Nelson town schools, did you not?—Yes.

726. You consider that there should be an amalgamation of the schools, by the abolition of one or more of them and the establishment of a central school, with the headmaster of the Boys' Central School or the headmistress of the Girls' School having supervision of the whole of the six schools brought under amalgamation?—Yes; I think one head-teacher could supervise all the work; there should be the head of the boys' department and the head of the girls' department.

727. Do you know that the amalgamation of such schools under similar conditions has taken place to a very large extent in Victoria?—No.

728. Do you know that a head-teacher has charge of two schools sometimes a mile and a half apart?—No.

729. *Mr. Stewart.*] You have a son a pupil-teacher at the present time?—Yes.

730. In what school?—Haven Road.

731. Do the conditions of that school admit of proper supervision of a pupil-teacher?—The head-teacher is in one part of the room, carrying on what is especially her own class, and perhaps exercises a certain amount of oversight.

732. Do you think that is proper supervision for a pupil-teacher?—No.

733. You know the country districts of Nelson fairly well?—Yes.

734. Do you think that all the country schools you have seen are necessary?—No; I have frequently seen schools I thought unnecessarily close.

735. Would there be any simple expedient of uniting those schools in any way?—Yes; it appears to me that at times the matter of a little bridge or so would make it possible for the children to get to a school not far away.

736. Your School Committees generally have a fair allowance made them by the Board, do they not?—Yes.

737. Has it ever come under your knowledge that at present School Committees are finding their books and other school requisites out of the Committee funds?—Yes; everything found for the children—all their school requisites.

738. *Mr. Luke.*] You say that the average attendance at the Toitoi Valley School is not as high as it should be?—Yes; according to the number of females in the town the attendance should be higher.

739. Is there any other reason besides the unhealthiness of the situation that would cause the small attendance?—I cannot say; I cannot imagine any other reason. I have had considerable experience of that school; my wife taught there, and my daughters attended the school, and I think the site very undesirable and unhealthy.

740. Is it not a central position?—No; but the worst feature is the dampness of the locality. It loses the sun very early in the day in the winter.

741. Supposing you were transferred to another education district where there was a university college, would you be prepared to keep terms and attend lectures?—Yes.

742. *Mr. Hill.*] I notice that you said you would like the assistants in schools graded and classified, and that you thought an assistant in the first class, where also the schools were placed in certain classes, should be equal to the headmaster of a school of the second class?—I said I thought assistants should be classified as first, second, and third, according to their certificate and length of service, and that the larger schools should be entitled to two assistants in order to equalise the amount of work.

743. Do you think it more difficult to organize a school of 250 compared with a school of 175?—I do not see the point; the organization would depend on the staff available.

744. Yes; but I want to know whether you think it is more difficult for a teacher to organize a school with an average attendance of 250 than if he only had a school with an attendance of 175?—I think there would be so little difference that it would be scarcely worth mentioning.

745. I will put the same question in regard to schools with attendances of 400 and 300?—I think there would be very little difference.

746. What is your opinion as to a maximum-sized school: would you approve of the graduated capitation grant, or would you stop at a certain point? Supposing we took a 600 limit, and said that the maximum salary paid to a master would be in a school of 600, do you think that would be a fair basis of classification?—I think so. I think the increase of 100 more scholars would make very little extra work.

747. Do you think that when a school reached 600 it would about remain at that?—I think when a school has reached 1,000 it has reached its maximum; the headmaster would have many certificated teachers, and more scholars to examine.

748. Would his time not be as much occupied with 600 as with 1,000, in your opinion?—With 1,000 there would be very much more supervision to be done.

749. Then, you are of opinion that a school of 1,000 should have a larger salary attached to it than a school of 600?—Yes.

750. And the same in the case of schools of 500 and 400?—Yes.

751. You approve of the progressive capitation grant?—Yes.

752. What, in your opinion, constitutes a just number of pupils to be given to any teacher to control—an ordinary certificated assistant teacher?—I should say one could manage very well 50 or 60; beyond 60 the difficulties are increased; at 70 the strain is very severe. I should say that thoroughly good work could be done in a class doing the same work up to 50.

753. Could a teacher in a mixed school, teaching all standards, manage as many as a teacher with a single standard?—No, certainly not.

754. Your experience has reference to moderate-sized schools?—Yes.

755. You think that 50 children could be managed by a competent teacher?—I should prefer 50 myself to 70 with a pupil-teacher; I have found that I could always get on very well with 50.

756. Are you in favour of retaining the services of pupil-teachers?—Yes.

757. Do you find that they are of great value in your school?—Yes, they are very useful; I recognise the necessity of training young men.

758. Would you not prefer a trained teacher to a pupil-teacher?—I should prefer a pupil-teacher in one room with one standard rather than have two assistant teachers in the same room.

759. Would you prefer to follow the classification which requires an assistant followed by a pupil-teacher?—Yes, in a country school.

760. *Mr. Hogben.*] You have given a good deal of thought to the subject of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

761. Your first argument was that assistants' salaries should be equal, or nearly equal, after passing a certain limit in the number of scholars?—Yes; that those doing similar work should be similarly remunerated.

762. You made an exception in the case of first assistants?—Yes.

763. Are you aware that in some of the large schools, such as one or two of the Christchurch schools, some of the work of supervision becomes so heavy that some of it has to be divided between the headmaster and some of the assistants?—In a large school here there is a provision made for that.

764. Are you aware that they have to divide up subjects like science, drawing, drill, and other subjects among three or four assistant masters?—Yes; the same thing is done here in the Boys' Central School.

765. They are taking part of the work that belongs to the headmaster?—I do not recognise that.

766. If they help to give model lessons are they not taking part of the work of the headmaster?—They may be.

767. You have had no experience of the large schools?—No.

768. Then, your opinions are simply based on theory, and not on practice; you have not had experience of a school of 1,000?—No.

769. Have you had any experience in a school of 400?—No, nothing above 300.

770. You have not actually had an opportunity of comparing a school of 400 with a school of 300?—No.

771. You have not seen the way in which the work of the headmaster may be divided up among the assistants?—No.

772. With regard to payments quarter by quarter, you say that a difficulty would arise when the children came to be passed up from the side-schools into the Second Standard; that the salary of the side-school teachers would be lowered?—I say that would be the tendency.

773. It might act in that direction?—Yes; it would be very hard for the teacher to have to suffer for the fact of having done good work in connection with the children.

774. Do you not think that the difficulty might be got over by making the payment on a year's average instead of on a quarter's?—If the quarter were taken into account it would lower the salaries of the teachers; on the other hand, a teacher might just send away no more than absolutely necessary, and keep a good full school.

775. Surely, if such a thing was done systematically for the whole year it would be detected by the Inspector?—It might be detected.

776. You think that there should be a certain number of prizes in order to keep up the standard of the profession and attract the young men?—Certainly. I think it would be better to grade assistants according to their status.

777. You are in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

778. *The Chairman.*] Reference has been made to the large salaries in certain schools as being the prizes of the profession: do you think that those prizes are numerous?—No.

779. Do vacancies frequently occur so that prizes can be gained by the teachers in the smaller schools?—Very rarely.

780. Is it not the case that teachers appointed to the headmasterships of such schools remain there virtually for life?—I cannot say; my experience is not wide enough for that.

781. Is there any method by which they can be called upon to retire?—No.

782. Then is it not a fact that they hold an interest in those schools for life?—I cannot say.

783. Do you think that a headmaster would cast a lot of his own duties on to his assistants?—No more than he could possibly help.

784. In your opinion, does it require an assistant to hold better credentials and qualifications in a school of 500 than in a school of 300?—No.

785. As an assistant you have taught a class up to 80?—Yes; I was once an assistant in a school half the size of the one I am in now, and my work there was just as hard as it is now.

786. Suppose you had Standard V. to teach, with 20 pupils, would you consider your work very much increased if you had to take double the number—40?—No, it would not be increased very much.

787. You would be able to perform your duties just the same?—Yes.

788. Do you think the pupils get on better when there is this greater competition, this feeling of emulation?—Yes.

789. Within a moderate limit you think that the numbers should be kept up?—Yes.

790. Do you approve of the system that is laid down in the suggested scale of paying teachers, both the headmaster and the staff assistants, according to the average attendance of the school?—No; I think that the roll basis is fairer. The attendance fluctuates, and is beyond the control of the teacher, and his salary suffers accordingly.

791. If this scale is adopted as it stands, and the Nelson schools remain as they are, what will be the effect on the salaries of the teachers?—We shall suffer considerably and unjustly.

792. Supposing all the schools were amalgamated into one central school, what would be the effect then?—I think each teacher, without exception, would receive an increase of salary.

793. Then, unless an alteration is made in the present method of education in Nelson, the teachers will suffer if a scheme of this kind is brought into operation?—Some would; others would benefit.

794. What class of teachers would benefit?—If the side-schools are considered as complete individual schools, then I think the teachers in those schools would benefit. The teachers of the central schools would suffer very considerably, and, as I think, very unfairly.

795. Do you think the number of pupil-teachers appointed by the Boards too many?—I think they are in excess; half the teachers in Nelson are pupil-teachers.

796. Do you think it is likely to bring about a state of congestion that will be prejudicial to teachers?—I think it will inevitably lead to that.

797. You are of the opinion that teachers should be paid according to their certificates, length of service, and other qualifications rather than according to the average attendance?—Yes; I think they should be paid according to the work which they do.

798. Do you consider that a teacher in a small school should possess the same ability as a teacher in a larger school?—Yes.

799. In that case, should there be equal pay for equal work?—Yes.

F. V. KNAPP, First Assistant Teacher, Boys' Central School.

Mr. Knapp: A great deal I intended to say has been already said, but there is one point I would like to bring before the Commission, though I do so with some diffidence. Under the regulations of the Nelson Board there are a number of teachers receiving a salary above the scale. In the scale the salary for the first assistant master at the Boys' Central School is £175 per annum. In other parts of the Nelson Education District there are several teachers paid according to the scale, but the assistants at the Boys' Central School are paid a salary, as I said before, in excess of the scale, owing to special circumstances. I would ask the Commission, in any recommendation they may make to the Department, that their recommendation will be made in such a way as not to lower the salaries of those teachers. I may say I served in a country school for three years as headmaster, and in a town school for seven years as headmaster. Owing to the amalgamation of schools, however, I was appointed first assistant master, at a salary of £200. Previously I had received under the Board's scale £225, so that I suffered a reduction not only in position, but in salary by £25; and I may say that there are other teachers in the service similarly situated.

800. *Mr. Hill.*] Did you receive house allowance?—No. I may say, with reference to the last appointment I had as headmaster of a town school, the average attendance had risen from 120 to 180, and there was every likelihood of it rising still higher, but owing to an unfortunate accident the school was burnt down. At the same time another school in the district was burnt down, and for that reason it was thought advisable to amalgamate the three schools into one. There is another suggestion I would make in reference to the peculiar position of our schools here containing pupils from the Third Standard upwards. Such schools might be compared to schools of a similar size in other districts, and be accounted as equivalent to schools with an attendance of 800 or 900, as the case may be.

801. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Would you approve of a system of periodically transferring teachers?—No.

802. Do you not think that teachers who are appointed to country schools have a much less chance of promotion than those appointed to town schools?—No, I do not think so.

803. Do they not get outside of what might be called the range of the public and official vision?—No. In this particular district teachers often receive *kudos* through pupils obtaining scholarships.

804. Do you think it right that a man should be left in charge of a school twenty or thirty years?—I should say not.

805. Then, do you not think that some system of exchange, transfer, or promotion might be carried out by the Board?—Yes, if teachers were agreeable; otherwise I would say nothing about it.

806. Do you think that the teachers in household schools, considering that many are not certificated just now, should come within the category of what you would call the permanent staff of teachers of the Board?—No, I do not think so.

807. You approve of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

808. There is a proposal to make the minimum salary in household schools £70 per annum: are you favourable to that?—Yes; I think it is a very fair minimum. I think there should be a living minimum wage.

809. Even if that involves the reduction of higher salaries in order to provide for it?—Yes.

810. Then, the effect of that is, of course, not to maintain the present high salaries that are paid, which are the prizes in the profession?—I think it is only fair, as I said before, that there should be that minimum wage.

STEAD ELLIS, Secretary, recalled.

Mr. Ellis: I may say, gentlemen, in regard to the question as to the cost of living in the Nelson District, that at one time there was an understanding on the part of the Board, a tacit understanding, that teachers on the Coast should receive from 10 to 15 per cent. higher salaries as compared with teachers in other parts of the district.

811. *Mr. Stewart.*] Was it thought that a dual scale was impracticable?—There was no regular printed scale then; the salaries were all fixed at the time as vacancies occurred.

812. In the event of a colonial scale of salaries being drawn up, do you think it practicable for Nelson, or any other educational district, to work on a dual scale, or do you think that it is impracticable?—Yes.

813. You think that to differentiate would be impracticable?—Yes.

GREYMOUTH.

SATURDAY, 4TH MAY, 1901.

S. HARRIS, Chairman, Grey Education Board.

Mr. Harris: I may state that the principal grievance we have is in regard to the large number of outlying schools in our districts. The salaries paid in connection with these are very small, and the schools are so situated that it is impossible to get good certificated teachers to take charge of them, for in connection with these schools we are only able to pay a salary of £56 a year. The schools are some six or eight miles apart, with an attendance as low sometimes as 5 or 6, and at other times, owing to the fluctuating population, 20 or 30. I am strongly of opinion that there should be a better scale of payment for the teachers who may be in charge of these schools.

1. *The Chairman.*] Has the Board been in any difficulty in regard to its finances?—Yes, at times.

2. Have you found the capitation inadequate to enable you to pay the teachers a reasonable salary?—Yes, that is the principal reason why we cannot pay them a fair salary. The capitation is not sufficient. The larger schools have to pay for the smaller, and it takes us all our time to make both ends meet.

3. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You have been losing about £36 alone on these small schools, have you not?—Yes, on some of them.

4. Have you looked into the proposed scale?—I have not had time to go through it.

5. Then, you cannot quite say what you think of it?—No.

6. Do you consider that your highest-salaried teachers are paid too low proportionally?—No.

7. Then, in any proposal submitted you would not wish that the salaries of your higher-paid teachers should be increased?—No.

8. But you would increase the salaries of those teachers in these aided or household schools?—Yes.

9. Do you think a £4 capitation grant sufficient to do that?—No, not when you come to consider the number of these small schools.

10. Would you suggest a higher capitation?—Yes.

11. What distance apart are these schools?—Six or eight miles.

12. Are there none within three miles?—No; there is one school close to the railway-line, but it is about four miles distant from any other school.

13. Has your Board thought out every means of centralising the schools?—Yes.

14. *Mr. Davidson.*] How many schools have you in your district altogether?—About thirty, I should think.

15. What is the average number of children attending these schools?—I cannot exactly say. The secretary will be able to give you that information.

16. Do you find, on comparing the salaries paid to the teachers of your district with the salaries paid to the teachers in other districts, that your scale is the lower one?—Yes.

17. Do you think it is on account of having so few large schools in your district?—Yes, or "paying schools," as we call them.

18. How many schools have you with an average attendance of over 75?—Four.

19. Which are the four?—The Greymouth, Cobden, Dobson, and Taylorville Schools.

20. Have you a scale of staff and salaries for the schools?—Yes.

21. Do you adhere strictly to the scale of staff and salary?—Yes, fairly so.

22. What is your opinion as to the advisability of having a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—It is a very large question. I would not like to give an opinion upon it, as I have not considered it sufficiently.

23. Would it not be in the interest of your teachers and in the interest of education that there should be no chance of your Board becoming financially embarrassed?—Yes, it would.

24. Then, if a colonial scale of staff and salary was drawn up, and was applicable to this district, would it not remove the financial embarrassment that has previously existed?—Yes.

25. Then, you would consider it desirable?—Yes.

26. *Mr. Stewart.*] Have you many teachers who have been in your employ for a lengthy period?—Yes, the bulk of them have been employed for a long time.

27. Have you a sufficient number of young teachers coming on to keep the average age of the teachers down?—Yes.

28. What becomes of your older teachers?—I suppose they die off.

29. Are they in your employ right up to the last?—Yes; we have some very old teachers at the present time.

30. Do you think it wise, in the interests of the teachers themselves and in the interests of education, that they should be retired when they reach a certain age?—Yes, I do.

31. Would it be possible for your Board to retire them?—No.

32. If a colonial scale made that possible in the future, would it not be a great advantage to your Board?—Yes, it would, and to the teachers also.

33. You stated that you thought that it was rather too large a question to say as to whether a colonial scale of staff and salaries would be advantageous: would it not be an advantage to your Board to have the salaries it had to pay to the teachers fixed and definite, and its other finance quite separate from the payment of teachers?—Yes, I think that would be an advantage.

34. You have only one large school in this district?—Yes; the Greymouth School.

35. Do you find that you are able to save very much on that school?—It relieves us of a great many difficulties.

36. At the expense of the teachers employed in that school?—No; the teachers there have fixed salaries.

37. Is your scale as high as it would be if you had not these small schools?—Yes; we cannot give more than our by-laws state.

38. *Mr. Luke.*] What is the salary of the headmaster of the Greymouth School?—£250; but he receives more now than formerly.

39. Have you a copy of the regulations of your Board?—Yes. [Copy of regulations and scale of salary, Exhibit 17, handed in.]

40. Is there any possibility of centralising these small schools, and using a means of conveyance for the children and teachers?—No; as I said before, there is only one school situated close to the railway.

41. *Mr. Smith.*] Is there any minimum attendance that your Board expects before it will grant an aided school?—I think in the by-laws 15 is stated as the number; but that is very high.

42. Supposing you had an application from the parents of five children to open an aided school, would your Board do so?—We have done it, though I do not approve of it.

43. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long have you been Chairman of the Grey Board?—Thirteen months, about.

44. How do you account for the preponderance of female pupil-teachers in the Greymouth School?—We have more applications from them.

45. Do you have many applications from male pupil-teachers?—Very few.

46. Is it not a fact that the headmasters of the schools invariably recommend females to become pupil-teachers?—No.

47. How do you pay your pupil-teachers?—I cannot say; you will find it in the by-laws.

48. How do you account for the fact that the teacher of the Ahaura School, with an attendance of 61, receives a salary of £142 10s., while the teacher of the Blackball School receives £157 10s., or £15 more, for 62 pupils—that is, an addition of one pupil over the Ahaura School?—I cannot say; the secretary will answer that question.

49. Do you employ sewing-mistresses in your schools?—I think the pupil-teachers do the sewing.

50. Do they get an allowance?—No.

51. Do the headmasters receive any allowance for instructing pupil-teachers?—I think so.

52. How much?—£5 a year.

53. On the whole, is the cost of living higher in the Grey District than it is in the average educational districts in the colony?—I think it is.

54. Consequently, you think the teachers require a slightly higher salary?—Yes.

55. In reply to Mr. Mackenzie, you stated that the capitation of £4, in your opinion, was insufficient?—Yes.

56. What is your rule with regard to the transfer of teachers: do you exchange or transfer from one district to another?—Sometimes we do.

57. Supposing that a teacher in one part of your district did not get on well with the Committee, would you make an effort to exchange?—Yes, with the consent of the Committee.

58. Do you consult the Committee with regard to appointments of teachers?—Yes.

59. Do you send the names in?—Yes.

60. You have very little opportunity of promoting your teachers on account of the few large schools?—Yes, very little opportunity.

61. You do not separate sexes in any of your schools, do you: you do not think it advisable?—No.

62. Do you consider the certificates of applicants when making an appointment? Is it not a fact that, perhaps, when a teacher with a D1 certificate applies for a situation, one with E1 or E2 will get the appointment?—Yes.

63. Do you discourage applicants from outside districts applying for appointments in the Grey District?—No, not now, though we did at one time.

64. Do you not think it would be better for the cause of education generally, and for uniformity of inspection and examination, if the Inspectors were placed under the central department, and were removable from one district to another?—Yes, I think it would be a good idea.

65. I suppose you experience considerable difficulty in getting qualified or trained teachers in the Grey, owing to the want of a training-college?—Yes.

66. With regard to female teachers, I see that there is a preponderance of female teachers in the Grey District: do you find that they are as efficient in the smaller schools as male teachers?—I do not think so; I think male teachers preferable.

67. I suppose the salaries are not high enough to induce male teachers?—No.

68. How many children do you consider that a female teacher can manage efficiently?—About thirty.

69. Teach them as efficiently as a male teacher?—Yes, I think so.

70. Do you pay her an equal salary?—No; or we did not.

71. With regard to these small schools, I suppose you would experience considerable difficulty if you proposed to close any of them?—Yes.

72. I suppose there is a considerable amount of pressure brought to bear on the Board to establish them?—Yes.

73. With regard to house allowance, have you residences for all the teachers?—No.

74. What course do you adopt in the case of these teachers who have no residences?—I think when the average attendance reaches a certain number they get house allowance.

75. Are there Committees in connection with all these smaller schools?—No.

76. Have they Commissioners?—They have what they call Provisional Committees.

77. Do your regulations allow an increase of salary to a head-teacher for every extra pupil in average attendance, or do you increase by grades?—It is an up-and-down increase: I think, by individual pupils.

78. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you know the details of the expenditure of the Board?—No, I do not.

79. I will put the question in another form. Supposing, for example, that the expenditure of the Board is about £1,000 for everything else except teachers' salaries, allowances, buildings, cost of training pupil-teachers, and so on, if the Board were to get £1,068 they would not feel any anxiety about the introduction of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—No, I should think not.

80. The Board would not feel that its power was being taken away by the introduction of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—No, I do not think so.

81. Of course, it would be understood that the Board would have the appointment and dismissal of teachers, subject to the consultation of Committee, as it is now. You are of the opinion that the Board would not make any objection?—No, I think they would not.

82. Can you tell me if all the schools with an attendance of over 50 have residences?—Some of them have not.

83. Have you any difficulty in getting teachers where there is no residence attached to the school?—Sometimes we have.

84. Is it easy for the teachers to find board and lodging in all the districts where they have to go?—It is very difficult in some parts; of course, it varies as to charges; perhaps they can get it for 12s. or 14s. per week.

85. Then, they can get accommodation?—Yes, of a rough kind.

86. *The Chairman.*] Do you find any great difficulty in obtaining teachers when vacancies occur?—No.

87. In these schools that are somewhat isolated do you experience any difficulty?—Sometimes. It depends on the situation of the school.

88. These schools are not situated very close to one another?—No; they are four, six, and eight miles apart.

89. I see you have not very many of what are regarded as small schools, with an attendance of under 15 or 16?—About eight.

90. Have you many applications from female teachers for these isolated schools—aided or household schools?—No; we have none.

91. Have you lost many efficient teachers through leaving for other districts?—Yes.

92. Is that owing to the salaries you pay?—No; I think it is because they want a change.

93. You think they become dissatisfied?—Yes, and want a change of scene.

94. I notice that you have over forty female teachers and only about fifteen male teachers, a proportion of practically three female teachers to one male teacher: do you not find any disadvantage on that account?—No, I do not think so; female teachers seem to get along very well.

95. Do the Committees ever make application for male teachers in preference to female teachers?—Yes, we have had applications of that kind in the large schools.

96. What are the reasons given?—They consider male teachers far better in schools of 70 or 80 to 100.

97. Take these schools with an average attendance of from 30 to 40: is there any disadvantage, as far as you are aware, in having female teachers at the head of such schools?—I do not think so.

98. You think the discipline just as good under a female teacher as under a male teacher?—From what I have seen I should say so.

99. Do you think that the salaries paid in these small schools are inadequate?—Yes.

100. Are you referring to the female teachers?—Yes; I said they required a higher salary.

101. Do you consider the headmaster and assistants in large schools fairly well paid?—Yes.

102. If they were to resign their positions, would you not have much trouble in getting the vacancies filled?—No, I do not think so.

103. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you lose any of your male teachers through taking up other professions?—Yes.

104. Have you lost any recently from that cause?—Yes; one recently.

W. R. KETTLE, Treasurer, Grey Education Board.

105. *The Chairman.*] I understand that you are the treasurer of the Grey Education Board?—Yes, I appear before the Commission in that capacity. I have been treasurer for seven or eight years, I have occupied the chair three years, and I have been on the School Committee about ten years, so that I think you will admit I have a pretty good idea of educational matters within the district. I wish particularly to bring before you the fact that we have an average attendance of 7 to 12 in about ten schools, and that on each of these schools the Board loses from £30 to £50 a year. In order to pay the salaries of the teachers, we have to deduct moneys from the teachers occupying positions as headmasters and assistants in the larger schools—in the Greymouth, Cobden, Taylorville, and Dobson Schools. These schools provide capital for the smaller schools, and were it not for these large schools it would be almost impossible for the Board to carry on. The Grey Board gets a small amount from the High School Board of Governors, periodically, to assist them. The school at Barrytown has an attendance of 12, and the teacher's salary is £64 a year. This is a very out-of-the-way place, and owing to the expense incurred in travelling to and fro—for the teacher must at times come to town to receive tuition—a salary of £64 is altogether inadequate. I might instance also the school at Red Jack's, the attendance of which is 9, and the salary paid is £56. We called for applicants for the position the other day, and we appointed a male teacher, I am ashamed to say, at the amount mentioned. I say it is practically impossible for that man to live and be honest. In the case of the No Town School the attendance is 8, and the teacher is a female whose salary is £56 a year. Of course, she is in a slightly better position, for she gets her board and lodging for about 12s. per week, though she is not able to go to town very often on account of the expense. It costs 5s. or 6s. to get to town.

106. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] By train?—By train and coach. I think, myself, that the teachers in these outlying districts, especially where the railway goes through, should receive a free pass, say, once a week to enable them to come to town for the purpose of completing their studies.

107. Do they come to town for tuition?—Yes. A teacher from Ahaura wishing to come to town would have to pay railway fares, and that I consider unfair. I think if the matter were represented to the Government, and something were suggested in the way of giving these teachers a pass, it would be found advisable to do so. I may state I am of the opinion that it would be advisable for the whole of the West Coast to be under one Board. A considerable amount of money is spent in departmental expenses, and the teachers have to pay for it. I think one Inspector would do for the whole of the West Coast, and a secretary with an assistant. If this were done there would be a considerable sum saved. I might say also, with reference to Inspectors, that I am strongly of the opinion that they should be the servants of the Government, and not servants of the Board, and that they should be changed or transferred periodically. One cannot get away from the fact that Inspectors do make friends in their district, for it is only natural they should do so, and on that account a system of transferring them from one district to another would be advisable. With reference to the capitation grant, I think that in districts like the Grey and Westland there should be a special capitation grant; each school should be graded, and paid accordingly. I think in some schools where the attendance is only 7 or 8 there should be a capitation grant of £5. In schools where the attendance is 15 to 30 there should be a capitation grant of £4 10s., and less for larger schools. As I said before, the Government are not providing the necessary funds for these small schools. They are maintained at the expense of the teachers in the larger schools. I have here a return of the salaries paid, and also the attendance of each school.

108. *Mr. Stewart.*] Up to what time?—Up to the 31st March. I may state that the Government has increased the salaries in these schools considerably, and deserve every credit for taking the matter in hand, and insisting that the teachers should receive the money instead of the Boards being allowed to spend in other directions. At the same time, I think the money should be given to the Boards, so that the Boards may allocate it among the teachers. I think the Boards are better able to judge what teachers are entitled to increased salaries, more so than the Government would be.

109. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you given any special study to the question of a colonial scale?—Yes.

110. Is it, in your opinion, desirable that there should be a colonial scale?—Yes; I think it would be a very good thing if it were carried out, save that there should be a special grant to

Westland and the Grey, and, I might add, to Taranaki District. You must take into consideration that, in reference to these small schools, we pay the full salaries to the teachers. We do not ask the residents in the district to contribute anything, and it is very hard at times to provide teachers for these schools with only an attendance of 7 or 8.

111. If under a colonial scale the schools of the colony were graded, and certain fixed salaries were apportioned for each grade of school, there would be no necessity for making an exception in the case of these small districts, would there?—Yes, there would be, for I understand that you do not take into consideration schools with an attendance under 12.

112. You said that, in your opinion, a special capitation grant of £5 should be paid to these small schools?—Yes.

113. If that is provided for in a colonial scale it would meet with your approval?—Yes.

114. Have you gone into the suggested scale carefully?—Yes.

115. Then, you will find that the very suggestion you make has been carried into effect, for you will notice it says, "Aided schools, 1 to 14, capitation £5"?—I have not had time to look through all the schedules. Even a capitation of £5 would be rather small for these schools; for instance, take the No Town School, with an attendance of 8, a capitation of £5 per head would give, say, £40, and, as we pay the teacher £60, there would be a loss of £20.

116. In your opinion, a minimum salary of not less than £60 should be paid to the teachers of these small schools?—I think nothing less than £75 should be paid, considering the cost of living, which is from 10 to 20 per cent. more than in the Grey. I would go so far as to say a salary of from £75 to £100 should be paid to the teachers of these small schools.

117. In the case of the Barrytown School, what is the average attendance?—12, and the salary paid is £64.

118. Under the suggested scale it would be £60 at a £5 capitation grant?—Yes; but you could not get a certificated teacher to take a position like that.

119. Take the school at Totara Flat, what is the average attendance?—20.

120. What is the salary paid?—£120.

121. Is that under your own scale?—Yes; the attendance has gone down considerably at that school. We have a teacher with a D1 certificate.

122. In 1899 you paid only £100?—Yes, but the attendance was only 16.

123. Under the suggested scale the salary would be £120?—Yes. We drew up a scale a few years back, and we could only pay salaries in proportion to the money at our disposal.

124. The suggested scale is as liberal as your present scale, is it not?—Yes.

125. What is the average attendance at the Granville School?—39.

126. What is the salary?—With the bonus the salary is brought up to £133 17s.

127. Under the suggested scale there would be a considerable increase?—Yes; but that school is entitled to a male teacher.

128. Have you not a male teacher there?—No; we have a male teacher at Totara Flat. I think it is unreasonable to expect a female teacher to take a school over 20; in that case there should be a male.

129. What is the attendance at the Ahaura?—58.

130. Have you looked at the suggested scale and noticed the effect it would have upon that school?—Yes.

131. Instead of the salary being £142 10s., what would it be?—About £162 16s.

132. So that it would show a decided increase?—Yes, an increase of £20.

133. Supposing the department gave a fixed salary of £75 to schools with an attendance of 15 and under 15, and left it entirely in the hands of the Board to establish the schools, what would be the result?—The Board would have to give a bonus over and above that—for instance, you could not send a male teacher to Barrytown at a salary of £75 per year.

134. What do you think would be the result if the Boards were allowed to establish schools under 12 without any control as to the number?—The Boards would give a fair and reasonable salary if they had the money to do so.

135. Do you think that the number of such schools throughout the colony would increase very largely when pressure would be brought to bear by residents in different parts of the districts upon the Board to establish the small schools where they might be unnecessary?—I do not think so. I think these schools should be established where there is an attendance of 5 or 6 children.

136. But do you not think there would be an unnecessary multiplication of these small schools, and unnecessary expenditure of money?—I do not think so.

137. *Mr. Stewart.*] You stated that the small schools were practically maintained at the expense of the teachers in the larger schools?—Yes.

138. You do not agree with the opinion expressed by the Chairman of the Board that it was not so?—I am giving you my opinion. The headmaster of the Grey School receives a salary of £250; with the bonus it amounts to £300; in any other part of New Zealand he would be getting a salary of £400, and the result is that the £100 he should be getting extra goes towards paying the teachers of these schools in outlying districts. The first and second assistants are also underpaid.

139. Have you many male pupil-teachers coming forward?—No; the salaries paid are too small.

140. Where do you get your male pupil-teachers from?—We do not get any; only about two or three graduated in our schools during the last seven years.

141. Have the bulk of your male teachers been in your employ long?—Yes.

142. Then, in the Grey District the average age of the teachers is higher than in other districts?—Yes; some of our teachers should be retired. They have been under the Board so

many years that I think they are entitled to a pension. While on the subject I think I may say that is another matter for the Commission to take into consideration. I think the suggestion should be made to the Government that teachers who have been in the service of Boards for some considerable time should receive consideration. We have one or two teachers under our Board who have simply broken down, and yet we have to pay their salaries just the same, for we cannot turn them on to the streets. One of the teachers I mention has been teaching for twenty years.

143. As a matter of fact, your contention is that you are not able to pay your teachers a living-wage?—Yes.

144. And after years of service you are practically obliged to keep them on when they should be retired in the public interest?—Yes.

145. Do you think it possible for your Board, or any other Board, to arrange some scheme for retiring teachers?—Yes, if an amount was paid to each Board so that a portion could be kept back.

146. I mean, under present conditions would it be possible?—Under present conditions it is impossible to do anything.

147. Under a colonial scale, do you not think that a general system could be arranged by the Government for the benefit of the teachers throughout the colony?—Yes, I think so.

148. You are of opinion that you would be able to work better under a colonial scale than going on as you are at present?—Yes.

149. You also say that the small schools are your greatest difficulty?—Yes.

150. *Mr. Luke.*] Have you any reserves in this neighbourhood?—Yes; if it had not been for them we should have had to close the smaller schools.

151. What are the endowments?—Approximately, £150 a year. In regard to these small districts, I think we should receive a goldfields allowance of 10 per cent. I think the Grey, Westland, and Taranaki Districts should receive it.

152. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Would you include Southland also?—Yes, if Southland is entitled.

153. You think they should be incorporated in the colonial scale?—Yes.

154. *Mr. Smith.*] Does your Board limit the number of children for which it will open an aided school?—No; we have always treated every case separately.

155. If you had an application from the parents of five children to open a school, would you do so?—Possibly, if they brought enough evidence to bear on the Board.

156. Do you think, as a matter of justice, that they should have a school?—Yes, I think they are entitled to have a school. My opinion is this: that when there is only an attendance of 5 or 6 the residents should come to the assistance of the Board, and perhaps pay half the cost of keeping a teacher. The majority of the Board are, however, against any direct tax on the residents.

157. You stated that you received £150 per annum from the primary reserve?—Yes, approximately; it goes towards paying the teachers in the ordinary way.

158. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] What is the attendance required before a school is entitled to the services of a pupil-teacher?—I think, from 36 to 50.

159. Would you not consider if the Government were to give an extra capitation grant for the small schools that there would be no finality to them?—No; I think you could depend upon the members of the Board doing what they thought was advisable in the interest of all concerned.

160. Then, you do not think your Board, or any Board, would be inclined to establish too many of these aided schools with very small attendances?—No.

161. Do you think it should be stipulated by the department that a school should not be established unless the average attendance was at least 10?—I think that average rather high. I should be agreeable to say that a school should not be established unless there was an average attendance of 7.

162. You realise the fact that the more of these schools there are established the less will be the remuneration of the teachers?—Yes.

163. You spoke about bonuses: what did you refer to?—The last amount voted by Parliament.

164. Do you give bonuses on teachers' certificates in this district?—No.

165. Did you formerly adopt that system?—No.

166. Have you looked through the suggested scale?—Yes.

167. Did you notice the minimum certificate required by a teacher?—No; I think the certificates should be according to classification.

168. Did your Board ever adopt the system of half-time schools?—No.

169. You are of opinion that such a system could not be carried out advantageously in this district?—Yes, I am of that opinion.

170. Do you consider there are too many pupil-teachers employed by your Board?—Yes.

171. Would it not be better to have one assistant instead of two pupil-teachers?—Yes. In the Greymouth School we should have at least one extra male teacher, and less pupil-teachers.

172. Your staffing is one headmaster, six assistants, and seven pupil-teachers?—Yes; but I think the staffing under the colonial scale would be better.

173. You think, on the whole, the suggested scale would be an improvement on what exists in your district?—Yes. With regard to the capitation grant, in the case of some of the larger schools the capitation of £3 15s. would be quite sufficient.

174. Education Boards financially strong, such as the North Canterbury and Otago Boards, would not require a capitation of £4, in your opinion?—I could not say definitely. As regards our Board, we have been in a hopeless state of bankruptcy for the last three years.

175. You do not discourage the employment of male pupil-teachers?—No, we do not discourage them; we are unable to get them.

176. Do you think you will have any difficulty in the future in obtaining duly qualified male teachers?—Yes.

177. *Mr. Hill.*] What is the limit of average attendance for which you give a salary of £56?—For an average of 10 the salary would be £60; an average of 12, £64.

178. Have you estimated the actual number of schools in your district carried on at a loss?—Yes; ten.

179. Have you estimated the amount lost?—On some we lose as much as £40, and on others £10. I think the average would be £25 on each of the ten schools, or, say, at least £200 a year.

180. Do you consider it is right for your Board to pay a salary of £56 a year in a school where the average attendance is only 6?—Yes. I consider that the teacher should be maintained at not less than £75.

181. Do you think the Board should pay that £75?—Yes, I do; and we would be willing to pay it if we had the money to do so.

182. Do you make an effort in your district to foster the giving of grants by parents who are residents?—No; I do not think it would be right to call on the parents, unless if it were in a school of 5 or 6 in attendance.

183. Do you think there is an amount of teaching-power lost in these small schools?—I do not see why the children should be uneducated because they live in those out-of-the-way places.

184. What was the whole of the average attendance last year for your district?—I have the average attendance of each school, and will hand it in to the Commission. Approximately, I think the average for the whole of the schools was 1,455, although I cannot say for certain.

185. Then, at a capitation of £3 15s. it would give you £5,456 5s.?—Yes.

186. And as your expenses are £4,870 19s. 6d. there should be a balance in hand?—But we have to pay our departmental expenses out of that.

187. Then, the difference would represent departmental expenses?—Yes.

187A. What sum have you for buildings?—£900 this year. In the case of the Cobden we will have to take a certain amount out of the ordinary fund, as the schools have been condemned.

188. Do you recognise that as being legal?—No; but it is only a temporary loan.

189. How are your schools inspected in the district?—Our Inspector lives at Feilding. He comes here twice a year, and is here from eight to ten weeks.

190. What do you pay him a year?—£200.

191. Do you think that is an effective method of controlling your schools?—I think that the Inspector should be appointed by the Government.

192. Do you not think it is possible for you to have one Inspector to do the whole of the work for the Coast?—Yes.

193. And control your schools more efficiently?—Yes.

194. Your present Inspector is like an absentee landlord?—No; he is on the road pretty well all the time.

195. I understood you to say that the Inspector's duties and the secretary's duties would be carried on better by one man?—No; I said that the duties would be carried on at less cost. I said I thought there should be one Education Board for the whole of the West Coast, including Westport, Reefton, Hokitika, and Greymouth.

196. Do you not think there should be one Inspector?—I think so. It is a matter of opinion.

197. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] What do you pay your Committee?—A very small amount—about £150 a year.

198. Do they find that sufficient?—No; they have to augment it by getting up concerts, subscriptions, and so on.

199. *Mr. Hogben.*] What schools do you find are carried on at a loss?—Schools with an attendance from 8 to 12.

200. Is there any school under 35 in your district that pays?—In the case of the Kokiri School it would just about pay for itself, the average attendance being 36 and the salary paid £96. The bonus would bring the latter up to £130.

201. Do you pay a male teacher £96?—No; a female teacher. A male teacher would receive £110 and bonus.

202. Then, the capitation grant of £3 15s. on that school, with an attendance of 36, would amount to £135?—Yes. We have been making a little on that school, but there should be a pupil-teacher receiving £20.

203. That would bring the total to £155?—Yes.

204. Seven shillings a head for office expenses would give another £12?—Yes.

205. The total would then be £167?—Yes.

206. And the £5 for the Committee would bring the total to £172?—Yes.

207. Then, the capitation grant being £135, if that school were staffed properly you would lose on it under your scale?—Yes.

208. The schools you lose on are simply schools under 10?—On the No Town school we lose the most.

209. You still lose on schools up to 35, and probably beyond 35?—We have not done so, because we have not been paying the teachers the salaries they are entitled to.

210. If the schools were staffed as they should be, and you paid the salaries according to your scale, you would lose on the schools?—Yes.

211. With regard to the expenses of the Board, could you give me the net expenditure of the Board for the last three years, exclusive of all allowances—such as teachers' salaries and allowances, house allowance, training of teachers and pupil-teachers, technical education, and so on—and inclusive of office staff and salaries, Inspector's salary, incidental expenses, &c.?—No, I could not; but the secretary will do so.

212. Assuming the expenditure was £768, exclusive of the amounts mentioned—for I am not quite sure of some of the items—and under this proposed scale you got £1,068, with the extra £300 the Board would have no difficulty in managing, would it?—I am not prepared to say whether that would be ample. I am quite certain £300 would assist us very much, but whether it would be sufficient I am not prepared to say. I would like to try it for one year.

213. If the introduction of a colonial scale gave you something of that sort you are of the opinion it would be a great boon?—Yes.

214. Schools over 20 have residences for the teachers, have they not?—Some of them.

215. A little while ago there were nine, how many are there now?—I do not suppose there are any more.

216. Do you pay house allowance?—Yes.

217. Supposing in the case of two schools of the same size with the same salary attaching, and in the case of one there was a residence attached, but not with the other, you would not consider the salaries equal?—No, certainly not.

218. Could the Board pay house allowance?—No, not out of the present grant. Many of the teachers have to stay in hotels in these outlying districts.

219. Is there a residence attached to the Greymouth School?—Yes; for the headmaster.

220. Then, the difficulty arises in some of the smaller schools?—Yes.

221. You expressed the opinion that £75 was too small for a minimum salary in these outlying country schools?—Yes; we cannot get a certificated teacher for that salary.

222. Do you think £80 would be fair as a minimum salary?—Yes, perhaps it would. Teachers may be able to keep themselves on £80, but it will take them all their time to do so.

223. You think they could do it if careful?—Yes; but I think that not less than a salary of £100 should be paid to male teachers, at any rate. A female teacher could, no doubt, live on £80, but a male could not.

224. At a capitation grant of £5 per head you would require 16 pupils to give a minimum salary of £80?—Yes.

225. On 7 pupils the amount would be £35?—Yes.

226. There would, accordingly, be £45 to be made up?—Yes.

227. Do you think it would be right to pay £45 for all schools of from 7 to 15 throughout the colony?—Yes, I do.

228. Supposing it meant an expenditure of £70,000 or £80,000 a year, do you think that would be justifiable?—I do not think it will amount to that, but even so I think the money would be well spent.

229. Would you rather take that amount from the teachers in the larger schools?—I think they should pay a proportion of it, even if it lowered their salaries £25 all round. I am quite certain the Boards would not object to a small amount being taken off.

230. What do you think of the advisability of asking parents or householders to contribute board and lodging or a money allowance? You would only ask them in the case of outlying districts, and why should you ask them any more than the residents in the town?—In the outlying districts they would not be able to bear the cost so well, on account of the cost of living being higher, and you would simply drive them into the town.

231. Then, you do not think it would be expedient?—No. I think the Government should come to their rescue, and give a special grant to meet this special case, no matter what it might cost, even if they have to put an extra penny a pound duty on tea to make it up.

232. Do you think it would be a good thing if a colonial scale were adopted that, in order to secure the stability of salaries, you should pay on the average of one year instead of the average of each quarter?—No, I do not.

233. Why not?—Because the population fluctuates so much. I think the Government should pay on the maximum attendance.

234. *The Chairman.*] In cases where the headmasters have not residences you allow them house allowance?—Yes.

235. Do you allow anything to the assistants?—No.

236. Why not?—Because we have not the money. No doubt they should receive an allowance, but the Board has not the money.

237. I suppose the assistants have to pay for board and lodging?—Yes; they do not live with the headmaster.

238. You think it radically wrong that the headmaster should have house allowance or a residence while the assistants get nothing?—Yes; I think headmasters and assistants should be paid proportionately, and be on a proportionate footing—*i.e*, the headmaster to provide his own residence.

239. You say that in the case of female teachers and male teachers £80 is sufficient in the case of females and £100 in the case of males as minimum salaries?—Yes.

240. What is the reason?—Females are able to live more cheaply than males. For instance, a man might be married, and therefore would have marriage responsibilities devolving upon him. For that reason I think there should be a difference of about 10 per cent. in the salaries.

241. You are of the opinion that male teachers should be in charge of schools over 20?—Yes; I think they are better able to conduct such schools than females. The reason we have so many female teachers is because we are unable to get males.

242. What is the reason why you cannot get males?—Because the salaries held out are not sufficient inducement.

243. Have you any difficulty in getting girls as pupil-teachers?—No.

244. Is not the reason you are unable to get males because there is a greater demand for male labour?—Yes, possibly that is one reason.

245. Why are girls so anxious to obtain positions as pupil-teachers at these small salaries?—I suppose the reason is that they prefer such positions to household service.

246. You do not think there is a greater demand for female labour than male labour in that respect?—No; I think it is simply a question of salary. If the salaries paid were fair ones there would be no difficulty in getting males.

247. Do you find any difficulty in putting those pupil-teachers into schools when they are qualified?—No, we do not seem to experience any difficulty in that respect.

248. Do you think it would be an advantage if you had fewer pupil-teachers?—Yes, I think it would.

249. Why?—Because I think it would be better to have more assistants.

250. Then, I assume the crop of pupil-teachers is too great for the soil?—Possibly so.

251. You say that the small schools are not paying?—Yes.

252. They have to be supported at the expense of the larger ones?—Yes.

253. With regard to the question of the capitation grant, do you think it fair to give the same amount of capitation to such districts on the West Coast as to districts in the larger centres?—No; I think there should be a graduated scale of capitation.

254. You think that the best basis?—You cannot have a hard-and-fast rule.

255. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Your fixed minimum salary in these small schools is £56, you say?—Yes.

256. And out of that the teacher has to pay board and lodging?—Yes.

259. I think you alluded to some of the wealthy Education Boards: will you enumerate some of them?—I understand that North Canterbury and Otago are the principal ones.

258. You think that the whole of the West Coast should be amalgamated?—Yes; because I think the expenses would be less.

259. Have you noticed that the sum for travelling-expenses of members of the Board is £222 15s.?—Yes. The expenses of the country members predominate, for they have to come considerable distances; the town members receive nothing whatever for expenses—for myself I have never received anything whatever.

JOSEPH PETRIE, Member of the Grey Education Board.

261. *The Chairman.*] Will you state to the Commission your opinion as to the desirability or otherwise of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—I think that the main source of all our trouble is the question of finance, and the fact that at the present time the Government have not placed the teachers upon a proper footing. I think the teachers are underpaid all round, and that the profession has not received that support and consideration at the hands of the people of New Zealand that it should. With regard to the salaries paid in these small schools, they cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered a living-wage. Our higher-paid teachers I consider are considerably underpaid also. I am of opinion that as our large centres of population depend to a great extent upon the outlying districts for support, such outlying districts and their small schools should receive greater support and attention than is now given. The children of settlers in these back-country districts should receive the benefits of education, let the cost be what it may. Supposing the cost did amount to, say, £70,000, is not the money well spent? I say emphatically that in these small districts wherever it can be shown that there are five or six children the State is not doing its duty if it does not provide them with the means of education and a competent teacher. That is the principle we have adopted here, and it is the principle that has landed us in trouble times out of number—in fact, once or twice we were nearly on the verge of bankruptcy. We get no revenue from the primary reserves, but by reason of the high-school endowment we have been able to divert that money towards aiding our teachers in these small district schools. Our great difficulty has been in getting properly trained teachers. They are not well trained; they have not gone through a training-college; they have passed the Sixth Standard and have been at once made pupil-teachers, afterwards graduating from one class to another. I have the opinion of some Inspectors and some of the best teachers that such a training is not sufficient. We are not able to get male pupil-teachers, for the reason that the salaries paid are inadequate. Our best male teachers leave us when a suitable opportunity offers, for we are unable to pay them a sufficient salary. They leave us to go to another Board, or else take advantage, as did one of our best teachers at the Ahaura, of embarking upon some other avocation in life. With regard to a colonial scale of salaries, I have not gone carefully into the matter. In regard to the recent schedule on distribution by the department, we had two teachers in the Greymouth School occupying the same position, but one of the teachers held a higher certificate and longer service, yet she received an increase of £5, while the junior, so far as service and classification are concerned, got an increase of £10, their salaries previously being equal. Referring again to small schools, I am strongly of the opinion that no teacheir in charge of one of those schools should receive a salary of less than £100 per annum.

262. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you refer to a male teacher?—Male or female. In our country districts it is absolutely essential that they should receive a salary of £100, for we assume that they should be in a position to save a small sum per annum. It will cost them at the very least from £60 to £70 a year to live and clothe themselves, and surely £30 a year is not a great deal for a teacher occupying a responsible position to save in a country like this. Provided that a colonial scale is sufficiently liberal and states a minimum salary of £100 it has my warmest support.

263. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You say that many of the male teachers are leaving the service in order to better themselves?—Yes.

264. Are you aware that such is the case throughout the colony?—Yes; possibly because the salaries are, as I said, inadequate.

265. Are you aware that perhaps more teachers have left good positions in Otago than in any other districts in New Zealand?—No, I am not aware of it.

266. Would you include those household schools in Marlborough and Nelson among those schools to which you say a minimum salary of £100 should be paid?—I have not sufficient knowledge of their position to answer.

267. Do you know anything of those schools?—We tried aided schools on the West Coast a good many years ago, but they did not work well. In small communities where they are found there is a certain amount of jealousy—parents find fault with the teacher, or the children find fault with the teacher, and the teacher's salary is made to suffer in consequence. I think it would be a good thing if the provision for those aided schools was struck out of the Act.

268. In any scheme that would be proposed would you contemplate giving a minimum salary of £100 in schools of 1 or 2, as in the Sounds and Nelson?—I should say in any district where there are 5 or 6 children it should be the duty of the State to do so, especially in the sawmilling districts about here, where the settlers are developing the country.

269. Do you think the salaries paid to any teachers in the service are too high?—I think the salaries are all too low.

270. All over the colony?—As far as I have noticed, in regard to the position the teachers occupy I think they are all underpaid.

271. You think the tendency should be to build up all, and not pull down any?—Yes.

272. *Mr. Davidson.*] Would you give a minimum salary of £100 in the case of any school?—Yes.

273. You give as a minimum attendance, 5?—Yes.

274. That means that the average cost per child might reach a total of £20?—Yes.

275. Would you allow unlimited power to Boards to establish these small schools, that might cost as much as £20 per head?—It would be a question as to whether the Boards are fit to be trusted with that authority. If the Legislature thinks so, I should certainly trust them.

276. If, for instance, you knew that in a certain district in New Zealand at the present time two out of every three schools were small schools would you not say that the Board had shown indiscretion in allowing so many to be established?—I could not say without knowing the circumstances.

277. Do not School Committees exercise influence over Education Boards at times, and bring pressure to bear upon them to establish these small schools where they may be unnecessary?—Not in this district.

278. What is your opinion as to amalgamation of the West Coast school districts?—If such were the case I think it would be an advantage, if local jealousy could be overcome.

279. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think the average age of your teachers is rising?—No. I should think not, for the reason that we are constantly appointing pupil-teachers.

280. Is the average age of your head-teachers rising?—No, I do not think so.

281. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You stated that the teachers of the colony are underpaid?—Yes.

282. How do you account for the fact, or are you aware of the fact, that the teacher of the Ahaura, with an attendance of 61, receives a salary of £142 10s., while the teacher of the Blackball School, with an attendance of 62, receives a salary of £157 10s., or £15 for one extra pupil?—There is a residence attached to the Ahaura School.

283. What do you consider a teacher should receive for teaching 61 children?—I would not fix the salary on the attendance. It seems to me, if you do so, you place him on a level with unskilled labour, and that you do not recognise ability, training, or the profession.

284. Suppose he received £182, would that be sufficient?—No.

285. You are acquainted with the salaries paid to teachers in other educational districts?—I compared them roughly.

286. Would you be surprised to find that the teacher of the Walton School in Otago is receiving a salary of £184, with an attendance of 61?—I would not be surprised.

287. In making appointments do you consider the certificates that the teachers hold?—Yes.

288. As a rule, you do not appoint teachers with lower certificates when you have highly qualified applicants?—Not unless we have good and sufficient reasons for refusing the highly qualified applicant. In one or two instances we have applicants with most extraordinary qualifications for positions where the salary was less than £100, but on making inquiries we found reasons that induced us to decline their applications.

289. Do you make provision for the transfer from one part of the district to another?—We endeavour to do it as far as possible, although we have found great difficulty in doing so.

290. Do the pupil-teachers teach sewing?—In some cases.

291. Is it a fact that female pupil-teachers get preference so that they will teach sewing?—No; we are unable to get males, that is the reason. Mr. Adams, the headmaster of the Grey School, has endeavoured to get males and failed, for too often after they are out of their time of pupil-teachership they are thrown out of employment.

292. You consider that it is advisable there should be a retiring-allowance or superannuation scheme for teachers?—Yes, if it could be arranged.

293. You pay uncertificated teachers 10 per cent. less than certificated teachers under the scale?—Yes.

294. Is it invariably followed?—No; we have broken the rule very often. In peculiar circumstances where small salaries are paid the Board has sometimes made a slight increase of £10. I might say with regard to the case of the Blackball School there is a residence attached to the school, while at Ahaura there is none, so that would account for the difference in the salary.

295. In regard to salaries, you consider there should be an individual increase?—Yes.

296. *Mr. Hill.*] You suggest that a minimum salary of £100 should be paid?—Yes.

297. Would you pay the same minimum salary to males and females?—I have very strong feelings on the matter. I think if there is a difference it should be infinitesimal.

298. You think a woman if she does the same work as a man should receive the same pay? —Yes.

299. Do you know the number of schools in your district with an average attendance below 20? —I do know, but I cannot give you the number from memory.

300. As I see, there are fourteen according to your last return, and you suggest that the salaries paid in connection with those schools should amount to £1,500?—Yes.

301. The amount at present on the capitation of £3 15s. amounts to £498 15s., so that, roughly speaking, you would suggest that £900 extra should be given?—Yes.

302. What number did you state as the minimum for which you thought a school should be established in these small districts?—5 or 6, providing there is not another school within a certain number of miles.

303. In regard to the minimum salary of £100 which you state should be paid in connection with those schools, you think that the Government should pay it, and that the Board should receive no help from the district at all?—Yes. I do not think that parents in outlying districts should be burdened in the way of being compelled to lodge or board the school-teachers, and it is a point I feel very strongly upon.

304. Would you suggest that rating-powers should be given to Education Boards?—No. You would at once destroy the national system of education.

305. If the Board said it could only give a certain amount, and if a local authority chose to make up the deficiency, would you not give it that power?—No.

306. You would require the Government to pay the full amount?—Yes.

307. What is your opinion as to the present inspection arrangements in your district?—I think they are not satisfactory.

308. Do you think it proper for an Inspector to reside out of his district?—No.

309. Do you think your schools could become efficient under such a system of inspection?—I might say we made overtures through the Westland Board with the hope of getting the present Inspector there to take over the duties of both Boards. If that were done it would be more satisfactory.

310. Do you not think it tends to laxity on the part of the schools when the teachers know the Inspector is away?—I should not think so; they have to stand the test ultimately.

311. *Mr. Hogben.*] What do you think would be the maximum amount for board and lodging for teachers in these outlying districts?—I should say £30 to £40 a year at the least.

312. And there are travelling-expenses in addition to that?—Yes.

313. *The Chairman.*] You stated as your opinion that the teaching profession generally is underpaid?—Yes.

314. You draw no distinction between the headmasters of large schools and the head-teachers in small schools in the country?—Yes, I do. I say that our small schools are much more underpaid than the larger schools—that is, so far as the West Coast is concerned.

315. Do you consider that teachers receiving salaries from £150 to £450 are underpaid?—Not in the case of teachers receiving £450, but I think teachers receiving £150 are.

316. Do you think teachers receiving over £300 up to £450 are underpaid?—Compared with the salaries paid in other Government departments, such, for instance, as the Railways and Customs Departments, I think they are.

317. Can you point to any department in the public service in which there is a considerable number employed and in which the salaries paid are higher?—The Post and Telegraph Department and the Customs; and the responsibilities are not nearly so great, certainly not from a moral point of view.

318. Would you increase the larger salaries paid to teachers?—I would not materially increase the large salaries.

319. Would you be astonished to learn that applications for teachers' vacancies carrying a salary of £150 are very numerous?—That is, unfortunately, owing to the small salaries we have paid in the past.

320. Do you not think, as shown by past experience, that in every branch of service if you increase the salaries the congestion would be increased?—It will be increased if we continue on under the present system. We employ too many pupil-teachers, and that is causing congestion. Pressure is brought to bear by the parents that they may receive employment.

321. Why should that pressure be brought to bear if the teaching profession is underpaid? —It applies principally with regard to females.

322. Is that not because there is a very poor outlet for female labour?—Yes, undoubtedly.

323. If you follow up the law of supply and demand, is there a great difference between the teaching profession and other professions?—No, I do not think so. It is a question of a living-wage, not so much the question of supply and demand.

324. Is it not because of the large salaries offered by other Boards that you are losing the best of your teachers?—To some extent.

325. Have you increased the salaries?—We have given the utmost we could.

326. What would you prescribe as a maximum salary?—I would not prescribe a maximum salary as a layman. I do not pretend to say what is the value of a thoroughly competent headmaster for a large school. His payment should be commensurate with his responsibilities.

327. You are of opinion that your pupil-teachers here have not facilities for receiving proper training?—That is so. We are compelled to send our pupil-teachers out to these small schools without their receiving proper training. We have no normal school here, and these teachers are unable to come into Greymouth to receive training. In many cases the best training they receive is that provided by the headmaster.

328. Would you be in favour of having training-colleges in the larger centres, so that pupil-teachers might be sent there?—Yes, provided that the State makes allowance for the tuition of

those pupil-teachers. If they were simply established in the larger centres and such aid was not provided, the benefit would be purely for the teachers in the districts where the training-colleges were established.

329. With regard to house allowance, do you think any distinction should be made between assistant masters and headmasters?—I think that the sooner the house-allowance question is thrown out altogether the better.

330. You think every teacher should make provision for himself?—Yes. I think the headmaster should receive a greater amount than the first assistant, and the first assistant more than the second assistant.

331. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you aware that out of 3,812 teachers in the colony not more than four receive over £400 per annum?—No, I was not aware of that; but it indicates the insufficiency of salary paid.

332. Are you also aware that out of 3,812 teachers in the colony 2,243 receive under £100 per annum?—No, I was not aware of the actual number. At the same time, I think it is a scandal to the country that such is the case.

W. A. Rundle, President of the Grey Branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Rundle: I would like to say that the proposed establishment of a colonial scale of staff and salaries meets with an appreciation of the teachers throughout the Grey District, and it is my desire to place their appreciation on record. With regard to the question of certificates, I consider, from my experience of assistant teachers in this district, that the D4 certificate is too high to expect from female teachers. I have left the teaching profession, but I may say that I consider it the hardest-worked profession in the Government service. I consider that if female teachers obtain an E certificate it is quite sufficient, for they are not only amongst the hardest-worked, but their responsibilities are very important.

333. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been the length and variety of your teaching experience?—I commenced as a pupil-teacher in a small school, and I have taught for fourteen years.

334. What was the average attendance in that school?—36 to 40. I was an assistant in the Taylorville School, and from there I went to the Ahaura School.

335. What was the average attendance?—68.

336. What position did you occupy in the Ahaura School?—Headmaster.

337. Did you ever work in a school with an attendance of from 36 to 75 in which there were two certificated teachers employed?—Yes.

338. Do you think it is possible for a female teacher to manage a school with an average attendance of 30 unaided?—I think it is possible, but I do not think she would succeed as well as a male teacher.

339. Do you think a female teacher would manage a school of from 35 to 40, taking sewing as well as other subjects, to the satisfaction of the Inspector if she had the assistance of a sewing-mistress?—Yes.

340. You do not think a sole teacher should be asked to manage more than 40?—No.

341. What form would you suggest the assistance should take when the attendance reaches 40?—Under this Board they give a pupil-teacher. I think an assistant should be given when the attendance reaches 40.

342. Do you think an assistant teacher should be given for a lower average than 40?—No; I think a teacher can manage up to about that average.

343. *Mr. Stewart.*] You stated you had left the profession?—Yes.

344. Was it because you considered there was not sufficient inducement to remain?—Yes.

345. In your opinion, are there a sufficient number of prizes in the profession?—No.

346. You do not consider that the four positions in the colony, carrying a salary of £400 each, are a sufficient number of prizes?—No.

347. Do you find a desire on the part of boys to enter the teaching profession?—No.

348. What do you think will happen if this state of things continues?—I think the profession would suffer considerably. For certain positions I do not consider that female teachers are as competent as male teachers.

349. Where is the supply of male teachers to come from in a few years?—It is hard to say; I am afraid they would be of a very inferior class.

350. If you were entering a profession what would influence you the most, the prizes of the profession or the mere average salary?—The prizes, undoubtedly.

351. Then, I understand you are of the opinion that it is essential in any branch of the public service that there should be a sufficient number of prizes in order to induce the best class of men to enter the service?—Yes.

352. You stated you had a teaching experience of fourteen years?—Yes.

353. Is there a sufficient number of young teachers in the district coming on to keep down the average age of the teachers in the profession?—Not of headmasters.

354. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do the teachers in this district experience any difficulty in obtaining appointments under other Boards, or are they boycotted by other Boards when applying for situations?—No, I do not think that is the case.

355. Does the Grey Education Board deal fairly with outside applicants for positions in this district?—Yes.

356. Do you consider it desirable to differentiate the syllabus work required for town and country schools?—Yes, I do.

357. Have you an examination centre on the West Coast for the examination of teachers?—Yes.

358. Where?—In Greymouth and Hokitika.

359. Do you consider it advisable to adopt a system of scholarships that will allow of the primary schools being made stepping-stones to the high schools, and the high school a stepping-stone to the university?—Yes.

360. You are in favour of a superannuation scheme for teachers?—Yes.

361. Are you in favour of placing Inspectors under the control of the central department, so that they may be transferred from one district to another?—Yes.

362. You consider it would be judicious to promote teachers, where they are deserving of promotion, if facilities are open to the Board?—Yes.

363. The weaker Education Boards would not have an opportunity of doing so?—No.

364. Are you in favour of equal pay for equal work as between males and females?—I consider there should be a distinction made, but not a very great one.

365. Are you in favour of a minimum living-wage of from £70 to £80?—Yes; but I think there should be more inducement offered to male teachers.

366. You are not in favour of the indiscriminate appointment of pupil-teachers?—No.

367. You consider it would be advisable to place an assistant teacher, instead of two pupil-teachers, in some of the larger schools?—Yes. My opinion is that some of the pupil-teachers in the country schools rather increase the work of the headmaster than decrease it.

368. Where would you get your trained teachers from, seeing that you have no training-colleges? Would it not mean that districts having normal schools, such as Otago and Christchurch, would be sending their students into this education district, to the detriment of your own young men and women?—Yes.

369. You would be in favour of the establishment of a training-college here?—Yes.

370. You do not consider the system of separating the sexes a judicious one?—No.

371. You are aware that such a system is adopted by some Boards?—Yes.

372. You are not in favour of the establishment of household schools?—No; I think that they lessen the independence of teachers considerably.

373. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you think a mistress, generally speaking, can teach efficiently up to 35?—Yes; but not so well as a male.

374. Then, your answer depended upon that hypothesis?—Yes.

375. What is your ideal maximum number that one teacher, within reason of course, should have in small schools from the infant standard up to Standard VI.?—35.

376. Thirty-five would be your ideal, rather than 40?—Yes.

377. Do you think that the difficulty with regard to the supply of trained teachers in this district would be done away with if the training-colleges were open to teachers from any part of New Zealand?—Yes.

H. Smith, First Assistant at the Grey District High School, examined.

Mr. Smith: Although many of the other previous speakers have spoken in regard to these small schools I must crave your permission to say a little more on the subject. We have eight schools in this district, with an average attendance of 10 or less. To pay the teachers in these schools only £5 a head capitation practically means starvation. No one has a right—and I say it emphatically—to expect a teacher to go into one of those districts and stay there for the sum of £25 a year. Some other provision will have to be made, or the schools will have to be closed, and that will mean very great hardship for the settlers in the back country if they are unable to get their children educated. There are one or two other points I would like to call the attention of the Commission to, and the first one is in regard to the assistants. In a school of from 420 to 480, which I might say is about the attendance of the Grey School, the first assistant receives a salary, according to the proposed scale, of £190; the second assistant, who ought to be a female according to the note attached, receives £125; and the third assistant, £100. Now, I would like to ask, what work would that third asssistant have to do? The first assistant, being a male, would no doubt have charge of Standards VI. and VII.; and the third assistant, being a male, would no doubt have charge of Standard V. In a school of this size Standards VI. and VII. would have about 50 children; Standard V. would probably have more; and I say that Standard V. teacher has got as much work to do as the teacher of Standards VI. and VII. It seems to me that you are paying a man according to the position he holds rather than the work he does. Now, with regard to the certificates of these female assistants in the small schools, there are a great many of these female teachers in this district who have been teaching for a number of years, some of them ten, twelve, thirteen years, and even longer. They obtain an E certificate, and to show you that they have done good work their certificates have been raised until we have now some of them holding E1. According to this proposed scale it is suggested they must hold a D4 or else they are docked 1 per cent. I think that is a very great hardship. Then, there is another matter: When the attendance gets over 600, or, rather, say, from 570 to 600, the certificate of the first assistant must be a D3; but when the attendance is over 600 the certificate is required to be a B2. I think that is too big a jump altogether. If there was a school of an average attendance of 599, and there was a prospect of that school averaging 602, it seems to me it would be better for the teacher to keep some of those children away rather than have his salary docked. So far as I can see, there is no provision made as to the length of time these averages have to be maintained before a change comes either in the scale of staff or salaries. In a district such as this, where we have fluctuations in the population, during some quarters the average is very low. Now and again we get a very bad attendance, due to wet weather and similar causes. It has been pointed out that the Grey District—in fact, the West Coast districts—have rather a big average, but that is only for the last year or two, and is on account of the weather having been particularly fine. Taken all round, I think it is a great hardship that the salaries of teachers should be based on the average attendance.

378. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is your position in the Grey Education District?—Nominally, first assistant, Grey District High School; that was the position I applied for in the application I made.

379. Why do you say "nominally"?—Well, because under this proposed colonial scale the assistant next to me is styled, according to the salary he receives, "first assistant." Therefore I say "nominally," because he has got the pay at the present time of a first assistant—namely, £190.

380. What salary are you receving?—The Board's fixed salary of £200, which is provided under the regulations.

381. You are not paid under any scale at present in existence?—No.

382. Then yours is a special case?—Yes. My position is defined under the Board's regulations, particularly as receiving a salary of £200.

383. The Grey District High School has been constituted since you were first appointed to your position of first assistant?—No.

384. What is the average attendance of the school at which you are teaching?—The average for the March quarter was 446.

385. *Mr. Luke.*] Is that the public school or the District High School?—The District High School.

386. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is the present staff of the school?—One headmaster, six assistants, seven pupil-teachers.

387. What would be the staff under the suggested scale: have you studied it?—Yes; there would be a headmaster, infant-mistress, five assistants, and five pupil-teachers.

388. That is, six assistants, counting the infant mistress?—Yes, and not allowing for any extra assistants for its being a District High School.

389. Of these six assistants on the staff how many, in your opinion, should be males?—At least three.

390. And how many does the scale allow for?—Three also, I think.

391. Is it not understood that there should be no more males than females on the staff?—Yes.

392. Then, that would allow for only two male assistants?—Yes, that is so.

393. As a rule, in your opinion, you say there should be at least three male assistants in mixed schools of that size?—Yes.

394. As a rule, what would be the work of first male assistant?—The work of Standards VI. and VII.

395. And the work of the second male assistant?—Standard V.

396. In your opinion, is the average woman physically strong enough to manage Standard IV. with an average, say, of 50 or 60 pupils?—No, she is not.

397. Do you think it would be better if there were a regulation something to this effect: that amongst the assistants there shall be as many males as females, leaving the headmaster out of the question?—Yes, I do.

398. *Mr. Stewart.*] We have heard a very great deal this morning about the paucity of male assistants in this district: what, in your opinion, has the most influence upon young aspirants for entering the position? Is it the prizes there are to be gained in the particular profession?—Yes.

399. You think, under the present conditions, that there are a sufficient number of prizes to induce the best of our young men to enter the teaching profession?—No, I do not.

400. You do not think, for example, that the position of headmasters in New Zealand, with an accompanying salary of £400, is a sufficient prize?—No.

401. I understand that you are first assistant at the Grey School?—Yes, nominally.

402. Of course, I take it you aspire by-and-by to obtain a better appointment?—Certainly.

403. With regard to another matter, do you object to the practice that has grown up throughout New Zealand in the country schools and elsewhere for the headmaster to receive a residence, while the assistant does not?—No, I do not think the principle is a good one; but still there are the residences attached to the schools, and what are you to do with them?

404. You are aware, either in this part of the colony or in another part of the colony, that young teachers have left the profession of late years?—Yes.

405. What has caused them to do so?—I suppose they find they can do better outside the teaching profession.

406. In the course of a few years, if this sort of thing goes on, what will be the position of our schools as far as teachers are concerned?—We will either have to import our teachers from elsewhere, or else take a very much inferior class of men.

407. We might, for instance, have to take a very large proportion of female teachers?—Yes.

408. Do you think that would be advisable in boys' schools?—No.

409. What bad effect do you think it would have?—It would spoil the discipline, for one thing.

410. Do you not think that female teachers would be able to exercise as much control over the boys as would males?—No, not the bigger boys.

411. Do you approve of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

412. You are desirous that such a state of things should be brought about?—Yes.

413. Why?—Oh, for a great many reasons: one reason being that it will prevent a very great desire that exists at the present time on the part of our teachers to continually change from place to place, a tendency which has a very injurious effect on our educational system. At the present time a teacher is not at all settled. He is always looking about for a better position—at least, that is my experience, so far as it goes. Another reason is that at the present time you are at the

mercy of the finance of Education Boards. The Education Board, for instance, might find itself in financial difficulties, and consequently drop the teachers' salaries 10 or 15 per cent., and I may say that this feeling of insecurity is playing havoc with the teachers at the present time.

414. They feel they have not sufficient security, and that their position is not safe?—Exactly.

415. Have you been long in this district?—I came here in 1889, but I was away for some time. I left the district in 1892, and then returned in 1896.

416. Are most of the head-teachers that were employed when you were here years ago still in the employ of the Board?—No, I should think not.

417. A great many of them have changed?—Yes.

418. How are their positions filled up?—In a majority of cases by female teachers. The schools have dropped in attendance, and the Board has appointed assistant mistresses.

419. Is the average age of the teachers about the same, or less?—A little less, if anything.

420. Do you think it possible for the teachers in the smaller districts to save sufficient out of their salaries to provide for their old age?—No.

421. You do not think any retiring scheme could be arranged under present circumstances?—No.

422. If the whole thing were left at the discretion of the Boards throughout the colony, and the Boards were required to do so by the department?—No.

423. Would it be possible under the proposed colonial scale for the department to make a general insurance scheme?—Not in the small schools on a capitation of £5.

424. Generally speaking, could it?—Yes, they might do it.

425. *Mr. Luke.*] Are you aware that in some of the larger educational districts, and in Auckland in particular, female teachers act as assistants in the large schools, taking the Fourth and Fifth Standards, and do their work admirably, without any strain on them at all?—No, I am not aware of it.

426. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You say that the teachers are leaving the profession: could you tell us any profession there is that the members do not leave?—No; of course, every man will leave a profession that he may be in if it is to better himself.

427. What class do you teach?—Standards VI. and VII. in the morning, and I take the High School in the afternoon.

428. And what is the work of the headmaster?—He takes the High School in the morning and general supervision in the afternoon.

429. Have you looked carefully through the suggested scale?—Yes, so far as I have had time.

430. As far as the staff is concerned, do you think it an improvement on what obtains at the present time in the Grey Education District?—Yes.

431. Do you think so with regard to the salaries?—Yes, with the exception of the small schools.

432. Do you not think the Board has been rather liberal in the establishment of these small schools?—No, not particularly; they were established years ago.

433. Do you not consider, if the Government were giving an increased capitation grant in the event of the establishment of small schools, that it would tend to the establishment of a very considerable number of them?—Yes, I believe it would.

434. And there would be a possibility of no finality?—Yes, probably.

435. And the salaries of the teachers would decrease consequently?—Yes.

436. How many pupils do you think a sole teacher can efficiently teach?—35.

437. Not more?—Well, from 35 to 40.

438. That is a male teacher?—Yes.

439. Then, how many do you consider a female teacher can efficiently teach unaided?—I should say 35.

400. *Mr. Hill.*] Were you appointed to take special duty at the Greymouth School?—That was not mentioned in the advertisement.

441. How comes it to pass that you are obtaining a salary not recognised under the scale: you must have been appointed to take charge of classes in the secondary subjects?—The advertisement did not state so.

442. What previous experience had you before you came here?—I was a pupil-teacher at Geraldine, and then first assistant in the same school. I was head-teacher at Paroa for about two years and a half, and then afterwards I attended lectures at Canterbury College for two years. I was also first assistant at the Kumara School for two years, and I have been first assistant here in the Grey for five years.

443. Then, from your experience, do you think that a female teacher could control a small school up to, say, 30 equally with a male?—Yes.

444. She is required, of course, to do the same kind of work in order to obtain a certificate?—Yes.

445. What is your opinion as to what she should receive as remuneration?—Very nearly, if not quite, as much as a man. If I made any distinction at all I should make it small.

446. Why would you make any distinction at all, then?—Oh, simply because it is a matter of supply and demand.

447. In a school like the one you are working in at the present time do you think the headmaster should have the distribution of the staff?—Yes.

448. I understand from you that you assume the first assistant master would have to take charge of Standards VI. and VII.?—I said he most likely would.

449. Then, you would not object to any arrangement the headmaster might make, supposing you, as the first assistant, were put on to take charge of Standard IV.?—No, I would not object.

450. So that you recognise thoroughly the headmaster's right to distribute the staff as he thinks fit?—Yes.

451. *Mr. Hogben.*] In Greymouth there is a District High School?—Yes.

452. You say the first male assistant has the work of Standards VI. and VII.?—Yes.

453. Standard VII. is separate from the High School classes, is it not?—Yes; Standard VII. merely does the revision work of Standard VI.

454. Then, Standard VII. does not do any extra work beyond the work of Standard VI.?—No.

455. Then, after all, Standard VII. is really Standard VI.?—Yes; but you must call it Standard VII. if the pupils have passed Standard VI.

456. You are of opinion that the work requires three male assistants?—Yes, at least three.

457. Are there not three now?—No.

458. How many District High School pupils are there?—There were 25 on the roll last quarter.

459. The number of pupils, then, has gone down?—Only about one.

460. Were there not 41 taking English in 1899?—English is not a subject of mine.

461. I am not referring to that; I am speaking of the number of District High School pupils there are?—Well, to my knowledge there have never been 31.

462. Are Classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 distinct classes in the High School?—Yes.

463. You are aware that there are 25 District High School pupils, and that the Board would receive, over and above the capitation grant of £3 15s., £180 in consideration of these High School pupils?—We have been in doubt about it.

464. There is what is called the District High School special scale. You may say there is £10 a head for the District High School pupils?—Yes.

465. Well, if there were 25 pupils, that would amount to £250?—That is so.

466. And that would enable an assistant to be obtained?—Yes.

467. Then, there is no great difficulty in regard to district high schools because of this vote?—But then if the vote was only £250—£10 a head for 25 pupils—and the first assistant is only to receive half the amount, that gives him a very poor salary; he is not recognised in any other scale.

468. There is full provision; supposing the Board gets the teacher to do half the primary-school work, they will have to make provision under their scale for that: you see what I mean, do you not?—Yes; I suppose he can then get paid for it.

469. You see that they would have to appoint an extra teacher?—Yes.

470. Of course, they need not employ him the whole time to do the secondary work, but he must be paid for the work he does?—Yes.

471. You say that the salaries of female teachers should be nearly as high as the salaries of male teachers?—Yes.

472. On the average, has a woman as many dependent on her as a man?—No, generally speaking, not.

473. Then, do you think it right that she should be paid the same salary?—I assume we are talking of a single woman.

474. I say the average woman. Do you think that the average female has as many depending on her as the average male?—No, I do not.

475. Then, does it not come to the same thing as the law of supply and demand?—No, I do not think it does.

476. *Mr. Hogben.*] Did you notice that four times as much weight was attached to the division as was attached to the class of certificate—that is, four times as much weight is attached to the figure of the certificate as to the class?—Yes.

477. *The Chairman.*] In reply to a question as to equalising the salaries of males and females, you are referring to small schools, are you not?—Yes.

478. You were not referring to the larger schools?—No.

479. Schools of 30 and under?—Yes.

480. And in cases like that you think that a female has a right to receive the same salary as a male if she is as efficient?—Yes.

481. You consider that her expenses are about the same?—Yes.

482. Are the secondary pupils numbered among the 446 attending the primary school?—Yes.

483. The Board receive the ordinary capitation grant on the District High School pupils?—Yes.

484. Together with the special capitation grant of £6 per head?—We have not received that yet.

485. You believe you are entitled to that?—Yes.

486. *Mr. Hill.*] In regard to my question as to the salary that should be paid to males, it had reference to schools below 30, where the work was the same and the responsibility the same: under such circumstances, do you think that the females should receive the same salaries as the males?—Yes; that was the meaning that I took from you.

Mr. Hogben: I might also state, Mr. Chairman, that I was not speaking of the burden of teaching, but the burden a woman has to bear in the community—the burden in having to provide for those who may be dependent on her.

487. *The Chairman.*] I assume that Mr. Smith was referring to single men and single women, were you not?—Yes.

488. Do you consider the present staff of the Greymouth School sufficient numerically?—Yes. The male assistants are weak; there are only two. I think there should be another one.

489. What is the highest standard taught by a female teacher in your school?—I have a female teacher relieving me in the afternoons. She takes Standard VI.

490. In the forenoon what standard does she take?—Standard III.

491. Do you consider that she is quite equal to the work of Standard III.?—Yes.

492. Do you think there would be any disadvantage arising from the fact of a female teacher taking charge of, say, Standard IV.?—It depends to a great extent; she would experience great difficulty in managing a class of 70, say. Of course, it depends upon the strength of the standard.

493. Do you know of any teacher able to manage a class of 70?—Yes; a strong male teacher would do so.

494. *Mr. Hill.*] Teach the class efficiently?—Yes; a male has had to do it in a great number of cases.

F. W. Riemenschneider, Secretary to the Grey Education Board.

[Mr. F. W. Riemenschneider, Secretary to the Grey Board, was called, and formally requested by Mr. Hogben to furnish a return of the Board's expenses for the years 1898, 1899, 1900.]

A. A. Adams, Headmaster of the Greymouth District School, examined.

Mr. Adams: I understand your time is limited, and therefore I will confine myself to making as few remarks as possible on the scale. I may say that I have not had it very long, and therefore I have only been able to run through it hastily. Of course, I am very strongly in favour of a colonial staff of salaries, and feel very keenly the want of one. I find that this scale proposes to give such salaries as will attract good teachers, or, at all events, prevent the best teachers from going into other professions. Well, sir, considering that smaller salaries are proposed to be paid under this scale than are paid in Queensland, New South Wales, and South Australia, where the cost of living is much less than in New Zealand, I do not see, myself, how the scale is going to attract abler teachers than are in the service at the present time, and also prevent them from entering other professions in New Zealand. A labouring-man at the present time gets 10s. a day, and I cannot see why any scale prepared for the teachers should be made lower than the scale in any of the Australian Colonies. This proposed scale proposes to remove inequalities and anomalies in salaries paid in various positions, but it seems to me that it rather creates glaring ones. The first assistant in a school with an average attendance of 599 must hold only a D3 certificate, which I have known on more than one occasion to be given to a pupil-teacher who passed the D examination before he was out of the service. Before he had finished his five years' service he got marks from the Inspector which placed him in Class D3. Now, I consider that a teacher who has only served five years as a pupil-teacher is hardly experienced enough for that grade.

495. *Mr. Hogben.*] You could give the name, I suppose?—Yes.

496. *Mr. Hill.*] Was it one of your own pupil-teachers?—Yes. Other of my pupil-teachers have been classified as soon as they had passed the D examination. Then, to continue, as soon as the average attendance increases from 599 to 600—only an increase of one, mind you—that teacher must hold a B2 certificate or else be mulcted in £ s. d., and I think that that is a very great hardship. No doubt, after all, these may be trivial matters that will be rectified by the recommendation of the Commission. All the certificates are recognised in the scale except A; and if the A is not considered good enough to be recognised, why should it be there at all? Another thing, the scale makes no allowance whatever for teachers who are able to teach special subjects, such as drill, singing, and so forth, and, as you are aware, gentlemen, a teacher may have a very high classification as a teacher and yet be unable to teach some of this work I have mentioned. Then comes the question of the assistants' salaries, which I think is a very important matter. There are fixed salaries according to the scale, while the salaries of the head-teachers are movable —that is to say, the head-teachers are to be paid on the average attendance, while the assistants receive a fixed salary all round. This is not fair, because no matter whether the attendance decreases or increases, whether it be 10, 20, 30, or 40, the salaries of the assistants remain the same, but the salary of the head-teacher varies according to the rise or fall in average attendance. Putting it in another way, this will mean that when the average attendance decreases the headmaster loses as much as 4s., and in many cases 2s., per head, while the assistant teachers lose nothing, and need not put out any special effort in an endeavour to increase the attendance. This applies all over the colony—there need be no special effort on the part of assistants to keep up the average attendance. I think that is a matter of great importance. The head-teacher takes all the responsibility, and if the attendance decreases is out of pocket in consequence. In some schools there are large infant departments. I might instance my own school as one of these, and the attendance of the infant department seriously affects the average attendance as a whole. Three or four months here during the year are very wet months, especially the spring months, and the attendance in the infant-room has dropped sometimes 60 or 80, and, as you must be aware, such a decrease brings down the quarter's average very considerably. I think, therefore, that some special allowance should be made for schools with large infant-rooms, if such an arrangement can be managed. With regard to the question of teachers' certificates, it appears there is a certain certificate assigned to a certain class by the scale. My opinion is that equal opportunity should be offered to all the teachers throughout the colony to obtain certificates. It does not follow at all that a very high certificated teacher is the best teacher, and most of the headmasters are D1 men. With regard to junior assistants, take my school, for instance: I would be entitled to a junior assistant who would be paid at the rate of £80 per year. I consider that that salary is not at all sufficient. A boy or girl who has to serve five years' apprenticeship receives, in the case of a girl £20 a year, and in the case of a boy £25 a year. During the course of their five years' service they have to undergo annual examinations, the result of which is that at the completion of their five years' term they are likely to be

appointed to a position at the munificent salary of £80. In my opinion, it would pay that boy or girl infinitely better to devote the five years, or even less than the five years—say, three or four years—to preparing for the Civil Service, where, in the event of them passing, they would be able to start at a salary of £65 a year, with an annual increase of £10. It is on account of the small salaries that are paid that, I find, the difficulty arises in securing pupil-teachers. The smart boys and girls find that it pays them infinitely better to devote their time to preparing for other professions. Then, when a pupil-teacher is appointed at £80 a year under the colonial scale, from the time the average is 330 until it reaches 480—it may reach it at any time or it may never—yet that teacher may grow old and grey in the service without rising beyond that salary of £80 a year. Then, again, a junior assistant does the work very often quite as efficiently as a senior. A junior assistant is able to handle the Third or Fourth Standard quite as efficiently as the more experienced men, and for that reason alone I think a salary of £80 a year is not sufficient, and I suggest that £100 is the lowest that should be paid in that case. A fourth-year pupil-teacher, under the scale, does not get within £10 per annum of what is paid the successful candidate for the Civil Service; and I consider that is hardly the way to encourage our able young men to enter the profession. There is another matter I would like to draw the attention of the Commission to, and that is that the proposed scheme offers a bonus to teachers who possess university degrees. I find that under the proposed scale I would be mulcted to the extent of £3 1s. because of my classification as a D1. Then, with regard to the cost of living, it was fully recognised by a former Cabinet Minister — the Hon. W. P. Reeves, now in England as Agent-General — that the cost of living is fully 25 per cent. more on the Coast than in any other part of the colony. That applies also to some parts of Marlborough, Southland, and Otago, where the cost is quite 25 per cent. higher than in large cities like Auckland, Christchurch, and Dunedin. Therefore the teacher who works on the West Coast, and in Southland, Marlborough, and Otago, is really receiving 25 per cent. less salary than would be the case if he held a similar position in one of the large cities. Infant mistresses receive £4 less under the scale than they are paid in South Australia, and in large schools £50 less than what is paid in South Australia. I think that is altogether wrong, and should not be. The scheme condemns the employment of pupil-teachers on the ground of cheapness; there is a good deal of truth in that contention. The training given in some of the training-colleges is not as good, although it may be better than that given in some of the primary schools. I think that pupil-teachers should be trained properly in a central training department in Wellington, or, say, one of the training departments for the North Island and one for the South Island, and that we should have no pupil-teachers in our schools—which is the case in England. Examine them physically as well as mentally, and when they have completed their term of service draft them out throughout the colony, and do away with pupil-teachers altogether. Now, with regard to the power of Inspectors, under the proposed scale an Inspector has it absolutely in his power to increase, at all events, a teacher's salary if that teacher is not in the first flight—that is, supposing the teacher holds a D certificate—according to the Inspector's like or dislike. With regard to that teacher, he may apportion his marks, or, on the contrary, may not; for, after all, Inspectors are only human. Therefore I think a better system of assigning marks should be devised, and some sort of Board or Commission should be appointed to raise the teachers from D5 to D1, and so on. I have in my mind's eye some excellent teachers who have not got a mark for years, although their work as females has been as good as the work of any male teachers in the colony, and I think that shows that the assigning of marks by Inspectors for promotion should be dealt with in some other way. I may point out that this phase of the question does not affect me at all. With regard to the system of classification, I should say it needs changing, and also the style of examination. Regarding the staffing of my school—as you are aware, it is a District High School—Mr. Smith is the first assistant, appointed by the Board. He takes Standards VI. and VII. in the forenoon, by arrangement made with him when he was appointed, and in the afternoon he takes the mathematics in the High School. I see no difficulty in arranging the staffing for a school of that kind.

497. *Mr. Hogben.*] Where did you get your information as to the salaries paid to the teachers in South Australia?—I took it from this scale on page 4.

HOKITIKA.

MONDAY, 6TH MAY, 1901.

Examination of Mr. ADAMS continued.

Mr. Adams: In continuing my statement in reference to the proposed colonial scale, I would like to point out that there is no provision made for the payment of an instructor of pupil-teachers; the matter is left optional to any Board to pay the teacher for that instruction, and by that means the scheme will give a bonus to some head-teachers in different districts. If you consider the rate at which teachers are paid in the south districts now for instructing pupil-teachers you will find a great disparity. I consider the bonus would be about £40 or £50 in the case of Otago, Wellington, or Auckland, whereas in my district a teacher would get nothing.

1. *Mr. Davidson.*] That is not a fact. At the present time teachers in Otago do not get a bonus?—Well, they do in some districts. Then, again, if the power is left in the hands of the Board, one Board will fix one scale and another Board another scale. Under the scale of my Board I am paid £5 for the first, £2 for the second, and £1 for every other, and I may say that I always have pupil-teachers. Other Boards probably would pay £15, £10, £5, and £3.

2. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] What proportion of candidates, after doing a three-years course, should pass the Civil Service?—Almost all my pupils go up at the end of two years, and the majority of

them got so well up on the list that they nearly all obtained positions during the year. Last year six obtained positions from the Government in the various towns of the colony, and I think there was only one who had been three years at the school.

3. How many did you present?—Six or seven; I forget exactly, though all went through; that was in 1900. This year I think I presented six, and five went through. The sixth was a rank duffer, one of those you could not do anything with at all, even if you had him ten years.

4. You consider that a district high school sending up pupils who have been three years studying should have some proportion pass to the Civil Service?—Yes; I consider a pupil who has gone through the Sixth Standard, and has had three years' study, should get through the examination.

5. And you consider that a school is not doing good work if it does not do that?—I would put them through in one year.

6. *Mr. Luke.*] You are in favour of a colonial staff of salaries?—Yes.

7. Do you believe in a special degree for teachers?—I do not know that I would call it a degree. I believe there should be a special examination for teachers, and all the subjects for that examination should be made so difficult that it would be impossible for any candidate to get through unless very well qualified in literature, educational science, and so on.

8. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Are you in favour of a superannuation or retiring-allowance for teachers?—Yes; but I can see no way in which it can be brought about, unless by the introduction of a colonial scale.

9. You are in favour of the Inspectors being placed under the control of the central department instead of under the control of the Boards, are you not?—Yes, I am. It would raise the standard of our schools all through the colony, more especially in some of the isolated districts.

10. Are you in favour of paying male and female teachers an equal salary when they do equal work?—Yes, provided the work is equal and is efficiently done in both cases.

11. You are in favour of a living-wage—a fixed minimum wage of, say, £80 a year; and you are of opinion it should not be fixed lower than that, are you not?—I am in favour of a minimum wage of more than £80 a year. I say it should be £100, and not below £100.

12. *Mr. Hill.*] What is the average attendance at your school?—460 last quarter.

13. What is your present salary?—£250.

14. Then, this proposed scale, if brought into operation, would be a considerable benefit to you?—Yes.

15. How many assistants have you?—Two male assistants, an infant mistress, and three female assistants.

16. One, I suppose, is given to you in consequence of its being the District High School?—Yes.

17. Do you only get one assistant in consequence of that?—One assistant and one pupil-teacher.

18. What is the salary of the first male assistant?—£200.

19. Is that male assistant appointed in consequence of yours being the District High School?—He gets an addition in salary of £20 more than he would otherwise.

20. You are aware that such a school would require a C1 certificate?—Yes.

21. Then, you would be penalised according to your classification?—Yes.

22. You are technically known as a trained teacher?—Yes.

23. You say you are in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.

24. How many pupils do you think a teacher should take in a school containing pupils no higher than the Second Standard?—I believe that the pupils in Standards I. and II. require quite as efficient teachers as pupils in higher standards.

25. But what number do you think a teacher should take?—40; at all events, not more than 50.

26. Which of the following schools would cost the most per head: (1) Small schools up to 30; (2) infant-schools; (3) schools with pupils up to Standard II.; (4) schools containing all the standards up to VII.?—Large schools.

27. Would the infant-schools cost as much as the large schools?—No, not as the schools are organized at present.

28. Do you think the appointment of pupil-teachers a mistake?—Yes.

29. You think they should have considerable training before entering on teaching?—Yes.

30. Do you think there should be established what might be known as a teachers' degree for teachers in primary schools?—I have put aside university degrees altogether. I say there should be a special examination, and if after passing that examination teachers obtain a university degree, well and good.

31. Supposing you were in need of a teacher in your school, and two teachers applied—one with academic status, but without experience, and the other with experience, but without the academic status—which would you select?—The man with the experience.

32. You think that experience is of the utmost importance in a public school?—Yes.

33. Do you think the proposed scale an improvement on the one under which the teachers are paid in Greymouth at present?—Yes.

34. You think, altogether, it is a step in the right direction?—Yes.

35. What are your objections to the proposed colonial scale?—They would take me a long time to go into.

36. Are they in consequence of certificates—the classification proposed?—That is one reason.

37. Is it the main reason for objection?—I would not say it is the main objection.

38. In your opinion, can a male or female teacher control more pupils?—A male teacher can control a larger class than a female teacher; however, my experience has been that some of my

female teachers have been able to work their classes and produce as good results and sometimes better results than male teachers.

39. You recognise that females can control the infant department better than males?—Yes, certainly.

40. Have you ever put a female assistant in charge of Standard VI.?—Yes; and Standard VII. too.

41. Are you satisfied with the work she does?—Yes.

42. Does she get a salary equal to the male assistant?—She gets £100 a year.

43. And what does the assistant get?—£200.

44. So that there is a difference of £100?—Yes; but the assistant, as I said before, takes the secondary class in the afternoon. And I would like to point this out: that a female teacher must have the supervision of a strong male teacher.

45. All things being equal, would you give the same salaries to males and females alike?—I most decidedly would give a female the same salary as a male.

46. You have a number of female teachers: would you prefer half the number of efficient teachers?—Yes; less than half, if they were trained.

J. McWhirter, Chairman of the Westland Education Board, examined.

Mr. McWhirter: I feel certain that before the Commission leaves this coast you will have got a great deal of information as to the working of our schools, and especially those schools in the outlying districts. I may say, in the first place, that our Board entirely agrees and is satisfied with the proposed colonial scale, though, of course, there are one or two exceptions in the scale with which we do not agree. On the whole, we are of the opinion that the Government is dealing very fairly with us, and this proposal to establish a colonial scale is a long-felt want, and one that should have been attended to long ago in order to place the teachers throughout the colony on a uniform basis.

47. *The Chairman.*] You have gone through the scale submitted to you?—Yes.

48. Do you think it would be an improvement on your own scale?—Yes, I do. I would like to point this matter out to the Commission: The assistant masters at the Hokitika and Kumara Schools will lose between £20 and £30 a year in salary, whereas the headmaster of the Hokitika School will benefit to the extent of £27 a year in salary, and the headmaster of the Kumara School £22. Our Board is of the opinion that this is hardly fair, seeing that the headmasters in all cases get the larger salaries. In some cases it means a loss of 5 to 6 per cent., and in others 4 per cent., on the salaries paid. I might instance another teacher in the southern portion of the riding who, unfortunately, will be subject to a reduction of about 4 per cent. in his salary because he does not hold the required certificate, as required in the schedule on page 5 of the proposed scale. We find it very difficult to get certificated teachers to go into these outlying districts, although we never appoint a teacher unless we are perfectly satisfied that the tuition given will be of a sound and efficient character.

49. *Mr. Hill.*] What is the name of the school you refer to?—The Okura School. The farthest of these small schools is 185 miles away. We have thirty-six of these small schools altogether, fifteen with an average attendance under 19, fifteen to twenty with an average attendance under 7, and eight household schools. Owing to geographical conditions, it is impossible for us to have a fewer number of these schools, and it is only right that the children of the settlers in those districts should receive the benefits of education. These men have gone out there to carve out homes for themselves, and to help to develop the colony, and therefore we are compelled to establish these aided schools for the benefit of their children. The capitation grant we receive from the Government is not sufficient, and it means that our Board is compelled to assist them to a very great extent. We want to still further increase the capitation grant, so that we could apply the extra money for the benefit of these small schools in the southern portion of the riding. If that were done we would have a reasonable chance of being able to pay fair salaries in order to induce certificated teachers to take charge of these schools. I want to point out very strongly to the Commission that if the schools in these outlying districts are not subsidised in some manner the result will be that the children of the settlers will be debarred from the benefits of education. Speaking now in regard to the household schools, several of them are taught by relatives of the family. We are practically compelled to adopt this course, for the reason that we cannot get other teachers. The reason we are unable to procure other teachers is because, were we to put in an outsider to teach in one of these schools where there is a member of the family capable of doing the work, you can imagine that the family will not make it particularly happy for an outsider who may step in. There is another matter I would like to point out, and that is, in some instances the female teachers do domestic work outside of their school duties. We have a clause distinctly stating that the Board must be informed of any arrangement by which such household tasks are required. I would like the position of these household schools defined more clearly, for they are as necessary as the aided schools. Up to a certain amount we pay an increased capitation grant, but the teacher has to be supported by the residents.

50. *Mr. Hogben.*] What is the size of the schools for which the teacher is so supported?—Schools of from 6 to 12 in attendance. At more than 17 in attendance they have to manage on the capitation grant. In a school of 12 the capitation would amount to £60, and a teacher would receive board and lodging, equal to, say, £30 a year.

51. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you think the schools are fully staffed: are the teachers able to manage the children under their care?—I might mention that in the case of the Hokitika and Kumara Schools it is stated that they are not fully staffed.

52. What number of pupils do you consider a sole teacher can manage efficiently?—Under our Board a sole teacher has up to 35.

53. Does the teacher complain that 35 are too many?—Yes, when they have to teach 35 with all standards.

54. An increased staff would mean in some instances reduced pay: how would the teachers consider such a proposal?—They would not like it.

55. Do you think they would prefer to teach the number they have at present?—I should say No.

56. Do you think the children suffer in the quality of the education imparted to them?—No, I do not think so.

57. Do you think any good would result by making the educational district on the West Coast more extended, so as to include all the schools as far as the Buller River?—I would not like to go so far as the Buller. I might mention I was a member of the Education Board before this district was separated from Greymouth. I was against the separation myself, and so also were one or two others, members of the Board; but the proposal for separation was carried against us. I have always held the opinion, and I hold the opinion now, that it would have been much better had the separation of the districts never taken place.

58. Do you think, taking into consideration the improved railway facilities and the size of educational districts in other parts of the colony, that it would make too large an educational district?—I think it would be too far to travel taking in the Buller. At the present time two members of the Board have to come twenty-five miles from the south, and to have a proper representation I think all members should attend as often as possible; for that reason I think it would be too much to ask members to go, say, to the Buller. If the Board was to sit in Greymouth I would be unselfish enough to say I would be prepared to go to Greymouth to attend the meetings, but I am not philanthropic enough to say I would go as far as the Buller.

59. A great deal has been said about the cost of living: do you think the cost of living is much higher on this coast than in other parts of New Zealand?—Yes, I do. I believe it would cost a man 10 or 15 per cent. more to support himself and family than it would in Canterbury, more especially if he keeps a horse, for there is no grass here, and he would have to buy fodder.

60. In connection with these aided schools, I see that at the Bruce Bay School the teacher, Miss Ritchie, receives a salary of £28 10s. for an attendance of 6 children: is that the whole she receives from the Board?—Yes, that is all.

61. And she has to pay the cost of living out of that?—Yes.

62. In the case of the Five-mile Beach School, the teacher there, a young lady, gets only £19 a year: do you know of that case?—I think that is a household school, and that the teacher is a member of the family.

63. In that case the family finds the board and lodging?—Yes.

64. Do you not think it would be better if a minimum salary was fixed for household schools?—Yes, I think it would be better. We have no fixed minimum salary. The Grey Education Board has a fixed minimum salary of £56, I think.

65. What do you think would be a fair salary for a certificated teacher in a household school, exclusive of board?—I should say, not under £56 or £60.

66. Do you mean that salary including board and lodging?—Yes.

67. What do you think of the proposal to treat those districts with household schools as special districts, apart altogether from the general scheme of staff and salaries?—I have always argued that Marlborough and this district should be treated as special districts. As I said in my opening remarks, we must continue to give these settlers' children education.

68. My question is, should not these household schools be treated as a separate question?—Yes, I understand. I do not think there would be any difficulty in doing that—say, by treating specially the goldfields districts or bush districts.

69. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] You mean newly settled districts?—Yes.

70. *Mr. Luke.*] All over the colony?—No; in the southern portion of the colony.

71. *Mr. Hill.*] Would you not apply it generally?—The matter of applying it all over the colony is a question for the Government; I know the position of Marlborough and of this district, but I cannot speak for other parts of the colony.

72. *Mr. Davidson.*] You say that eight of the thirty-six schools are household schools?—Yes.

73. How many are aided schools?—Nineteen.

74. In your whole district, then, the other nine are not household or aided schools?—Yes, that is so.

75. Have you any limit to the number of children required before you authorise the establishment of a household school?—No, there is no limit.

76. Have you found at any time, so far as your experience goes, that pressure is brought to bear on the Board to establish these small schools where they are not absolutely necessary?—No.

77. Under the suggested scale these schools would be treated somewhat more liberally than at present?—Yes.

78. What is the average attendance at the Hokitika School?—234.

78A. Is there a district high school at both Hokitika and Kumara?—No; only at Hokitika.

79. Under the district regulations the Hokitika schools will be treated more liberally and differently from the ordinary primary school?—Yes.

80. Have you taken into consideration the fact that the Board may apply the amount of capitation gained by the pupils of the secondary department towards the payment of the salary of the first assistant, and that the salary represented here need not necessarily mean the salary paid to the first assistant in the District High School?—No.

81. You have only one teacher up to 35?—Yes.

82. Have you compared that staffing with other districts in the colony?—Yes.

83. Do you find it as liberal here as in other districts?—In some districts the staffing is more liberal; in others it is about the same.

84. Have you compared it with the staffing in the Australian Colonies?—No.

85. Would you be surprised to learn that your staffing is as liberal as the staffing allowed in the British colonies and in other parts of New Zealand?—I am not prepared to say anything with regard to the British colonies.

86. Have you heard complaints that the staffing is not sufficiently liberal?—I have heard that in schools of that size, where they have to teach all the standards, they teach the pass-subjects, but have to neglect the others.

87. If the syllabus were modified so as to differentiate between that class of schools and the larger schools, do you think that would help to remedy the evil?—Yes.

88. In schools between 36 and 50 you allow a head-teacher and a pupil-teacher: have you heard any complaints as to the staffing of that class of school?—Yes; at 50 a pupil-teacher is not sufficient, though it might be at 36. Of course, it might be sufficient if you had a pupil-teacher in the second year, but not if you had one in the first year. I should prefer doing away with the pupil-teachers, and putting assistants in their place. I think that would be a step in the right direction.

89. From 76 to 115 you allow a head-teacher, one assistant, and one pupil-teacher: do you find the staffing in that class of school sufficient?—Yes; I do not think there is much grumbling.

90. *Mr. Stewart.*] In regard to household schools, did I understand you to express your disapproval of a relative of the family being employed to teach?—No; what I meant to say was that in most instances relations of a family did the teaching, and that we could not very well help it, as we were unable to get others, for reasons I gave in my opening remarks.

91. Apart altogether from that, do you think it is a wise thing that the State should allow such a course to be continued?—It is a very wide question. Perhaps a household school may be ten, fifteen, or twenty miles from another school; but while it does not seem right that the State should act as a "wet nurse" to a household, the question arises, what are you to do? You cannot debar the family from getting education altogether.

92. If provision were made by the Government to the effect that they would not make special contributions to any teacher who was a member of the family, are you not of opinion that the family would hesitate very much before attempting, as you say, to make it too "hot" for another person who was put in charge of the school if they knew they would be unable to get any one else?—Yes; I think if a special regulation of that sort were made it would be a good thing. I do not know that it would altogether meet the difficulty, but it would tend towards it.

93. Still, you think the family would hesitate before attempting to get rid of an outsider?—Yes.

94. Have you any reason to suppose there has been any abuse in your district by making the teachers do household work, either by force of influence or in any other manner?—I think so, in one or two cases.

95. And it is quite possible there may have been other cases which you knew nothing of?—No, I do not think so, because warning was given that if it was attempted again we would withdraw the teacher.

96. One of your objections to the proposed scale is because of the fact that the salaries of the assistant masters at Hokitika and Kumara Schools would be reduced?—Yes.

97. What is the average attendance of the Hokitika School?—234.

98. What is your first assistant receiving at the present time?—£185; there is a grant from the High School Board of £30.

99. That leaves £155 per annum?—Yes.

100. The headmaster receives £252 12s.?—Yes.

101. Then, with the grant from the capitation on the High School pupils you would be able to rectify the difficulty, and give the first assistant master an increased salary?—Yes; but the first assistant master at the Kumara School would not be assisted.

102. What is the average attendance at the Kumara School?—210 or 212. There is no district high school.

103. What is the salary of the first assistant master at Kumara?—£150.

104. You state he would lose in salary if the proposed scale was adopted?—Yes; between £20 and £30.

105. You say you are unable to get male pupil-teachers?—Yes.

106. Have you experienced that difficulty for some time?—Yes.

107. I think you stated that it was owing to the fact that when he had completed his pupil-teachership course there would be no appointment open for him?—That is the position here. We are unable to send them to the training-colleges, such as would be the case in Otago or Canterbury.

108. If the training-colleges were established, one at each of the four centres, and a system of scholarships established, do you think it would help your district?—Yes.

109. What becomes of your teachers when they get old?—Many of them go into other professions. We have not very many old teachers; I can only call two to mind.

110. Under your present system of payment, is it possible for your teachers to put something aside in order to provide for old age?—In some instances it is; it depends on how a man is prepared to live. A man with a salary of £150, and wanting this, that, and the other, would not be able to save much; but a single man, with economy, would be able to save something out of £150. On the salaries we pay, I fail to see how a man with a wife and family can save anything.

111. You are of the opinion that an insurance scheme or retiring scheme would be beneficial?—Yes.

112. Do you think it would be in the interests of the public?—Yes.

113. *Mr. Luke.*] You state that there are thirty-six schools in the Westland District, and that twenty-seven of them are either aided or household schools?—Yes.

114. You think it is absolutely necessary, in the interests of education, that they should be established?—Yes.

115. Is there any possibility of amalgamating them, or making them half-time schools, and having itinerant teachers to visit them?—In the southern part of the colony it would be impossible. We tried half-time schools and itinerant teachers on the Christchurch Road, but it was not a success.

116. You think it is desirable, in the interests of education, that the Grey and Westland Districts should be amalgamated?—No; I said it was my opinion that it would have been better had the separation not been brought about.

117. Are you of opinion that it would be better to have an amalgamation?—I am not prepared to say that now.

118. *Mr. Smith.*] How far is it from the Upper Otira to the Lower Otira?—Twenty-two miles.

119. I mean from the Upper Otira School to the Lower Otira School?—I think, about ten miles.

120. How far is it from the Kanieri Forks to the Kanieri School?—About five miles.

121. Would it be possible for the children to come from the Kanieri Forks to the Kanieri School?—No, it would not.

122. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long have you been Chairman of the Board?—Five or six years.

123. On the whole, you are favourable to a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

124. You consider it a great improvement on what obtains under the various Education Boards at present?—Yes.

125. Do you consider that the teachers as a whole, taking New Zealand all through, are adequately remunerated for the work they do?—I think the higher teachers well paid, but not the assistant teachers.

126. You consider there is too much of a gap between the headmaster and that of the assistants?—Yes.

127. The headmaster gets a residence, or house allowance, and a salary very much higher than the first assistant, who has no house or house allowance?—Yes.

128. Are there many teachers in Westland leaving the service of the Board for other pursuits or avocations?—No, I do not think so.

129. What is your opinion as to the staffing under the suggested scale?—I like it. It seems to me it will largely do away with pupil-teachers for assistants, and I am of opinion there are too many pupil-teachers.

130. I think you said Kumara was understaffed?—Yes; we give Hokitika a junior assistant and a pupil-teacher because it is a district high school.

131. Under the proposed scale the Hokitika School would be staffed as follows: The headmaster, three assistants, and three pupil-teachers?—Yes.

132. The proposed staffing would be the same in the Kumara School as what obtains there now?—Yes.

133. Do you not think the teachers would prefer to do the same amount of work and receive a fair salary rather than the schools should be overstaffed and the salaries reduced?—Yes; I have always maintained that.

134. Do you think a school with an average of 36 can be taught efficiently by a sole teacher?—Yes; a teacher will do the work in the pass-subjects, but the other subjects will have to be neglected. I think it would be far better to have an alteration in the syllabus.

135. You would differentiate in the syllabus in the small and large schools?—Yes.

136. What is your opinion with regard to the number of pupils a sole female teacher can efficiently manage in a school?—It is a very hard question. There are some females who can control 36 children equally and perhaps better than a male, but in other cases they would not be able to do so. I would rather see a male teacher in charge of a school of 36 than a girl. The females get preference on account of being able to teach the sewing.

137. Do you think a female teacher can efficiently teach a school of 30, as compared with a male teacher?—Yes.

138. Do you consider she should receive the same salary as a male?—That is for the Government to say.

139. You do not believe in equal pay for equal work?—Yes, I do; but we do not get it. Speaking for myself personally, I do not get it.

140. You have a preponderance of female teachers on account of their being able to teach the sewing?—Yes.

141. Do you have more female applicants for positions under the Board than males?—Yes. If the same thing goes on all over the colony as with us there will be no male teachers in a short time.

142. What is the reason?—There is not sufficient inducement for boys when they have served their pupil-teachership course.

143. I see by your regulations that your Board consults with the School Committee, to a certain extent, in the appointment of teachers: is that rule invariably followed?—No.

144. What procedure do you adopt?—The Inspector and myself go through the names, and put a suitable list before the Board.

145. Does your Board give preference to applicants holding the higher certificates?—No, not in all cases. We give preference to those with experience. We might find a teacher with a degree but having no experience, and at the same time we might have a teacher with a D1 certificate and experience. In that case we would appoint the teacher with a D1.

146. You remember an appointment recently made to the Kumara School in which a teacher with a D1 certificate was appointed?—Yes.

147. Were there any other applicants with higher certificates?—Yes.

148. How many?—Six or seven.

149. Were there not five B1s, three A2s, six B2s, and one C1?—Yes.

150. And these were overlooked and a D1 man appointed?—Yes. We found that the man with a D1 certificate was quite good enough. If it had been the District High School in Hokitika he would not have got the appointment; but he was sufficiently qualified for the Kumara School. We could not send some of the other names on for other reasons.

151. What were the reasons?—Private reasons.

152. You do not preclude applicants from other districts?—No.

153. Do you publish the names of applicants?—No.

154. Supposing a teacher applied for a position, do you think that he would care about seeing his name in the paper as an unsuccessful candidate?—We do not do that.

155. How is it, then, that the names of the applicants for Kumara got into the paper?—I do not know; we cannot prevent the paper getting hold of the names.

156. In making promotions in your larger schools, do you promote members of the staff of the school, or do you advertise the vacancies?—It depends. I think the appointment we recently made was the first instance in which promotion has been given, so far as I am aware.

157. Supposing, for instance, the headmaster of the Hokitika School were to resign his position, would you promote the assistant or would you advertise?—We would advertise the vacancy.

158. Do you know of any case in which a teacher from this district applied for a vacancy in another district, and whose application was declined because the teacher was from an outside district?—No.

159. I see the members of your Board charge expenses and travelling-allowance for attending meetings?—Yes.

160. I suppose you think you are quite justified in doing so, although there are some Boards who do not?—Yes. In our case the expenses are very small; I get 15s. for coming twelve miles to attend a meeting, and to stay in Hokitika all night.

161. Do you consider that it is practicable to convey the children from the small schools to a central school?—Of course, in some instances I admit it would be beneficial to amalgamate the schools and have one central school, but the trouble is to bring it about. These districts have been made school districts, and it would be a trouble to do away with them.

162. Do you not consider your Board has been rather liberal in the establishment of these aided and household schools?—No.

163. If other Boards adopted the same principle, would it not tend to diminish the teachers' salaries?—It has already done so in Westland.

164. Do you not think there should be a minimum attendance of 10 before you should establish a school?—No. If a man goes into the outlying districts, are you going to debar his children from the benefits of education?

165. You would not establish a school for every householder who went into one of those districts with his family?—No.

166. Do you think it is a question of ways and means?—I think the Government, when they send settlers into such districts, should provide their children with education.

167. Do you consider that higher salaries should be paid in districts where the cost of living is higher?—Yes.

168. Have you any education reserves in Westland?—Yes.

169. Do they bring you in revenue?—Not a great deal; it all goes back to the Government. It is deducted from our capitation.

170. Do you not receive a certain sum for the cost of secondary education?—Yes.

171. If this proposed scale came into operation, and some of the salaries were threatened with a reduction, do you think that reduction should take place straight away, or that the present salaries should remain in force until the teachers leave and new appointments have to be made?—If an assistant appointed at a salary of £120 or £160 was going to have his salary reduced by £20 or £30 I think he should have three months' notice.

172. Have you any difficulty in securing certificated teachers in Westland?—Only in the case of the small schools.

173. You notice that, according to this suggested scale of staffing, teachers holding lower certificates than the proposed minimum are to be penalised: do you approve of that?—No, I do not.

174. You are of opinion that teachers in the various districts have not the same opportunities for obtaining certificates?—That is so.

175. I suppose you feel the want of a training-college on the West Coast?—Yes.

176. Do you think a system of scholarships should be introduced in order to allow the brighter pupils to receive the benefits of education and pass on to the universities?—Yes.

177. Are you aware of the fact that the most important schools in the various districts throughout the colony are under the control of teachers holding D1 certificates:—Yes.

178. Do you consider a D1 certificate sufficient for a teacher in any primary school?—Yes, if the teacher has experience.

179. Do you consider that the salaries paid to pupil-teachers are adequate?—Not if you are going to try and keep them on after they have passed their pupil-teachership course.

180. Are you of opinion that the Inspectors should be placed under the control of the central department instead of under the Boards, and be removable from district to district, so as to secure

uniformity of examination and the assignment of marks?—I have always advocated that they should be removable, but I think there would be a difficulty.

181. In what way?—I think a new man coming into a district would not have the opportunities of knowing the district or the wants of the district.

182. You are afraid that the Board would lose control and influence over the Inspector?—Yes.

183. Do you favour the separation of the sexes in the larger schools?—No.

184. Does your Board trench on the Teachers' Fund in the repairs to buildings, &c.?—No; a portion comes out of the Building Fund.

185. You are in favour of a superannuation scheme or retiring-allowance for teachers?—Yes.

186. You consider, on the whole, the proposed colonial scale of staff and salaries would be for the benefit of the colony?—Yes.

187. You do not think it would tend to interfere with or diminish the power of Education Boards?—No, I do not think so.

188. *Mr. Hogben.*] In regard to the capitation grant to district high schools, how much of the £200 is spent on the Hokitika District High School?—The secretary of the Board will be able to give you the figures.

189. £200 is spent on the Hokitika District High School out of the special grant?—Yes.

190. The fees amount to £183 7s. 6d.?—Yes.

191. The High School Board gives £100?—Yes.

192. Then, for special High School purposes you receive £483?—Yes.

193. The Westland Education Board has £483 under existing circumstances out of which to supplement the salaries over and above what is allowed under this scale?—Yes.

194. Then, do you think there would be any difficulty in adjusting the salary of the first assistant?—I do not think so if the £200 is a permanent vote.

195. Supposing you cut that out, there would still be £56 payable under the new District High School Regulations?—Yes.

196. Then, with the £183 you have, and £100 from the High School Board, together with the other £56, would give you £339?—Yes.

197. Then, do you not think that £339 would be sufficient to adjust the salaries in the District High School?—Yes, I think so; but we have to give a junior assistant and a pupil-teacher.

198. You are paying £280 now extra?—Yes.

199. Under the scale you would be entitled to one extra besides that?—Yes.

200. And you would still have £59 to give to any teacher you liked?—Yes.

201. Then, the difficulty will be entirely done away with so far as the Hokitika School is concerned?—Yes, to a very considerable extent.

202. How much do you propose to increase the salary of the first assistant above the scale?—That would have to be considered when we know what we are going to receive from the Government.

203. There would be over £80 available: you would not increase him more than that, would you?—No.

204. In other words, there would be quite enough out of the District High School grant to meet all difficulties?—Yes, if the figures are correct.

205. The figures are correct; there is £339 available, and you only want £280, leaving you an additional £59: is that so?—Yes, I suppose that is right.

206. £183 would be for fees, and £100 would come from the High School Board: is that right?—We want to do away with the fees.

207. If you do away with the fees it will still give you more than you are spending now; it will give you £298, and you only want £280. How many District High School pupils have you?—Twenty-eight.

208. Then, with the £30 to every district high school given by the Government, and £6 for each pupil, it would give you £198?—Yes.

209. £198 and £100 from the High School Board would give you £298?—Yes; the question assumes a different phase now. The Government coming to the assistance of district high schools will be of considerable assistance, and make the question clear.

210. With regard to the question of training-colleges, if they were open to pupil-teachers, would that settle the difficulty you mentioned in regard to male pupil-teachers?—I think it would go some way towards it.

211. You stated also that you objected to penalising teachers holding certificates lower than required as the minimum in the scale?—I meant that you should not penalise teachers in the southern portion of the riding.

212. Then, your answer simply referred to those smaller schools?—Yes.

213. Supposing that the staffing of the schools introduced an assistant at 40, it would mean giving a little higher salary to the teachers of schools under and up to 40?—I think it would, from 35 to 50.

214. I will put the question in another way: If, giving not more than 35 pupils to one unassisted teacher, you could still raise the salaries of the teachers in those schools above your scale in Westland, do you not think it would be better than to give them 40 pupils and raise their salaries a little higher still?—Yes, I think it would.

215. What do you think is the value of board and lodging in a household school?—In Hokitika you cannot get board and lodging under £1 or £1 5s. a week. In South Westland the cost of living is dearer, and I think you would pay 25 per cent. more.

216. But you would not think board and lodging in a household school worth £1 5s. per week?—No; but I think it is worth £1 a week in these districts where the cost of living is dearer.

217. Suppose a condition were made by the Government or by the Board that in schools below 12 the salary should be brought up to the minimum that might be fixed—say, £80—by contributions from the residents, and that you might count board and lodging equivalent to £30 a year: what would be your opinion of that?—That is not free education.

218. No; but is it not the way to assist education in districts where otherwise it might be very expensive to maintain it?—If you do that you shut out certain families from getting education.

219. Would you be willing to pay those schools £80,000 a year all over the colony?—Yes; I think they are as much entitled to it as to the old-age pensions.

220. *The Chairman.*] Is your Board getting out of debt or getting into debt?—Getting into debt.

221. As the result of your work last year, is your debit balance greater at the end of the year than it was at the beginning?—Yes.

222. I see in your annual report that the debit balance was £209 2s. 2d., and the net result of the year's operations is a loss of £157 9s. 5d.?—Yes.

223. The General Account shows a debit of £168 11s. 7d., and if you began the year with a debit balance of £209, and end with a debit of £168, does that not show you are getting out of debt?—Yes; but a special grant removed the debt.

224. You approve of the colonial scale?—Yes.

225. Do you think the headmasters and assistants of your leading schools approve of the colonial scale?—Yes.

226. Do you think it fair and reasonable that a headmaster should receive more than double the amount of salary that is paid to an assistant master?—No.

227. Do you think it fair that a headmaster receives house allowance and the first assistant does not?—No, I do not. I never saw, myself, why an assistant should not receive it.

228. In the country schools do you think any of the teachers underpaid?—Yes. In schools of 50 to 70 I think they are underpaid.

229. Is it desirable to have as competent a master in a school of 50 to 70 as in a school of 200 to 300?—I think it is desirable that the teacher should be capable of instructing the subjects in the syllabus efficiently; but probably the control of a large school is a different thing to a small school, and, no doubt, you have to pay for control.

230. Do you assume that the master of a school from 50 to 70 would not be capable of controlling a larger school?—I could not say.

231. But you are of opinion that there should be as competent men in charge of small schools as in large schools?—Yes. But I recognise that there are some men who may be able to control a school of from 50 to 70, but would not be able to do so in a school of from 200 to 300.

232. You think that the salaries of males and females should be more equalised?—Yes.

233. Should salaries be paid on average attendance?—I think not; it is a question that has been threshed out all over the colony.

234. You think climatic conditions affect the attendance?—Yes.

235. With regard to your aided schools, is the education imparted tolerably good?—Yes; with one or two exceptions, we have always had very good reports from the Inspector.

236. Judging from the reports of your Inspector, the system of education in this district must be tolerably efficient?—Speaking from my point of view, I think it is. We have always contended that our results compare favourably with those of districts in other parts of the colony.

237. If the Government gave you an extra capitation of 5s., do you think you would be able to get along very well?—I do not know about that; it is a matter of considerable calculation.

238. You wish to have the teachers in the smaller schools more adequately paid than they are now?—Yes.

JOSEPH GRIMMOND, Member of the Board, examined.

Mr. Grimmond: I may say that I am speaking for the Education Board of Westland. When this suggested colonial scale came before us we agreed with it to a very great extent. I think there are only two exceptions made, which I think have been spoken of by previous speakers. One of the objections has been quite got over by the grant to the Board; but the others still remain, though I have no doubt we will manage to do something in that respect. We quite recognise that this revised scale relieves a number of the teachers in the southern portion of the district. As I said, we look upon this proposed scale as a betterment of the existing conditions, and also as being better than we would be able to do had we an increase of 5s. a head capitation. We think there should be a minimum living-wage given to the teachers. The Board is of opinion that it would be better if the Government inspection was general throughout the colony, instead of being confined to special districts. We wish to impress very strongly the necessity for giving outside aid for special districts, right down to Jackson's Bay. If we do not give them some assistance in the way of establishing household schools it means that their children will not be able to receive any education at all; and there is no doubt, as I said before, that in such scattered districts there should be special treatment in respect to these small schools. So far as I am personally concerned, I do not see that it would matter if the Education Boards were done away with. In the early days—say, thirty years ago—no doubt Education Boards were of use. Now they are merely of use as distributing bodies. Committees worked under the control of the Government I think would be better. I do not think that teachers' salaries should be paid on average attendance. For instance, supposing a man were appointed to a big school at a salary of £250 or £300, if the average attendance decreases that man is unable to get away from the school, and we have not the power to promote him, and there he has to stay, while his salary dwindles down until he perhaps is receiving only £120 or £130. He is made to suffer unjustly, and I think you will admit it is very unfair. It is a wrong principle that he should be like the captain of a ship, paid for so-many passengers, if I may use the simile. I think such a principle should be obviated by the teachers being paid as the servants of the general department.

239. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you think in all cases that the Government would possess the necessary local knowledge that is possessed by members of Boards, and so be able to do the work as well?—The officers and Inspectors would have that knowledge.

240. As a member of the Board, have you not often discovered that the information supplied by Inspectors has not been quite as safe, as you subsequently found out by a fuller investigation?—Yes, that is so.

241. Do you think, therefore, that the Government, in the case of a teacher situated as you pointed out, should have the sole right to promote that teacher?—Yes; I think it simply amounts to the same thing as promoting any other Government officer.

242. Do you think that other Committees in other districts would be willing to accept the transfer of a teacher in the same manner as a town might accept the transfer of a Postmaster?—Perhaps not; that would be a matter necessary to take into consideration.

243. What is your opinion as to making the whole of the West Coast one educational district—say, from Martin's Bay to the Buller?—I should prefer a colonial scheme, and would sooner see the whole of the Education Boards in the colony brought under one government.

244. Would you not consider it a step in the right direction if there was one Board for the whole of the Coast?—I think that would be going too far.

245. *Mr. Stewart.*] Have you noticed a paragraph on page 3 of the proposed scale, entitled "Transition from the Old System to the New"?—Yes.

246. Would not some system of that kind do away with the hardships which would fall upon teachers if there were no method of transition?—Yes.

247. You have been a member of the Westland Board for a long time, have you not?—Yes; thirty years.

248. Do you think it is essential to the welfare of any service that there should be a certain number of prizes in the service?—I do.

249. Do you think it would be wise to so closely approximate the salaries of assistants and head teachers?—I certainly think an assistant teacher ought to come within 25 per cent. of the salaries of the officers above him.

250. That an assistant master should receive three-fourths of the salary paid to the head-master—a salary equivalent to three-fourths?—Yes, that is my idea.

251. Do you think it would be wise to very closely approximate the salaries of all the teachers in charge of schools?—No, I do not; not upon the actual size of the schools. In the case of a teacher with 80 children under his charge, I do not think that because another man may have 100 children to teach it is a reason that he should have a salary 20 per cent. higher.

252. Has it ever been your experience that a man who could control a school of 50 or 60 children would not be able to control a school of 400 or 500 children?—No. I dare say it is the same with school-teachers as with others. I have seen a man capable of handling a few men, but when in charge of a large number completely lose his head.

253. You are of the opinion that it is absolutely necessary to recognise special ability and general controlling management when actually possessed by a teacher?—Yes; and a teacher should be paid well, for they are rare qualities.

254. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Does your Board favour the exchange and promotion of teachers from one school to another in the education district?—Yes.

255. Have you had exchanges?—Yes.

256. Did the Board consult the Committees beforehand?—Yes.

257. Do you not consider that the salary of a teacher should be based on the four quarterly returns rather than on one quarterly return, so that at the beginning of the year a teacher would know what his salary would be for the whole of the year?—I do not think that should be the basis; I think it better as it is.

258. According to your regulations, where not more than four candidates apply for a vacancy you only submit one name: what is the procedure then in the event of the Committee failing to recommend that nominee?—I think in the last case there were three or four applicants, and we sent the names of all on, finding they were suitable.

259. Do you generally adopt the recommendations of the Committee?—Yes; in no case where we have sent the names on have we done otherwise.

260. Do you pay equal salaries to male and female teachers?—No, we have not done so.

261. Do you not consider the salaries paid are rather small?—Yes; but we are unable to pay higher salaries.

262. With regard to the aided or household schools, you would experience considerable difficulty if you proposed to close any of them, would you not?—As far as that goes, we could close the whole of them, and assist our revenue greatly by so doing, but it would be at the expense of the settlers in the districts. Their children would be unable to receive the benefits of education.

263. Do you not consider that there should be a limit to the establishment of these schools requiring a certain number of pupils to be forthcoming before a school should be established?—In regard to the number of children, I think the limit should be 3, and the distance of these schools seven or eight miles apart.

264. Are the School Committees satisfied with the amounts you allow them?—They are not satisfied, and never will be.

H. L. Michel, Member of the Education Board, and Representative of the Hokitika High School Board, examined.

Mr. Michel: It appears to me the ground has been generally covered, but I would like to say a word or two in reference to the small or household schools. I say unhesitatingly that I think the system in vogue in Westland in regard to these schools is the only one that will meet the case.

I do not favour the suggestion that it would be right to bring the salaries of the teachers up to £50 or £60 and board and lodging. In the case where you have a household school with an attendance of 4, and the teacher, a relative of the family, is receiving a salary of £20, you will see, on consideration, that it is, after all, a subsidy to that household of £20 a year, for the teacher generally is the eldest girl in the family, and lives in the house. Taking into consideration that view of the question, you will see that the cost of board and lodging does not count. Generally, I believe it would be a calamity to close these schools; but, on the other hand, to increase the salaries must result in failure, because the colony, in my opinion, is not able to stand it. In reference to the appointment of a teacher at the Kumara School, I may say that the Westland Education Board has not, generally speaking, excluded outside teachers, and the circumstances in this case were rather exceptional. We had applicants for the position who were well qualified, no doubt, but we thought that it was a very good opportunity for a case of promotion of one of the three or four teachers who had served under the Board for many years. In another case, where we made an appointment to Staffordtown School, an outsider was appointed to the vacancy. I may say that a great number of the applications we get are from persons who have had no great teaching experience, and, while we may have applicants now and again with very high educational attainments, on analysing the position we find the bulk of the applicants have not the experience. Generally speaking, I strongly favour a colonial scale of staff and salaries, with a bush or goldfields allowance, where the conditions existing are very exceptional. I do not think the words "newly populated districts" meet the case.

265. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you aware that one-sixth of the schools in the colony have an average attendance under 15?—I did not know, but I am not surprised to hear it.

266. You would favour the granting of a capitation allowance to such schools, as is done in the Westland District?—Yes.

267. The suggested scale allows a capitation grant of £5 to such schools: that is somewhat higher than the capitation allowed in Westland at the present time?—Yes.

268. Would there not be a probability, if unlimited power was given to Boards to establish such schools, that they would increase in number to a very great extent?—From a colonial point of view I think the answer must be Yes.

269. Would you be in favour of the department having power to prevent the establishment of such school unless on the recommendation of the Inspector?—Distinctly, Yes.

270. *Mr. Stewart.*] With regard to the appointment at the Kumara School, had the teacher you mentioned been previously employed by your Board?—Yes, for a number of years.

271. He was appointed to the head-teachership?—Yes.

272. I assume the Kumara School headmastership is one of the few prizes you have in your district?—Yes.

273. Do I understand you made that appointment first because you considered the teacher competent and entitled, and secondly with a view to encouraging your own teachers?—Yes. In the first instance, when the late headmaster resigned, the position was advertised. We then decided that we should confine the applications to the teachers in the Westland District, so that the whole of the names of those from outside districts were deleted from the list, and the names of three or four teachers submitted to the Kumara School Committee, and they selected the present headmaster.

274. Extending that principle all over the colony, are you not of the opinion that there should be a sufficient number of prizes in the profession?—Yes, I am.

275. Are you of the opinion that there should be a certain number of prizes in every profession?—Yes.

276. And you would apply that principle to the teaching profession?—Yes.

277. With regard to these household schools, I understand you to say, or imply, that you are not in favour of the employment of relatives of the family in such schools?—Not necessarily; the conditions prevailing render it absolutely necessary that you should employ them. No young person outside the family could live on £20 a year and pay board and lodging out of that amount.

278. Are those aided schools taught for a certain number of hours each day?—They are supposed to be.

279. Have you any doubt about it?—I do not think so. Judging from the Inspector's reports, we get a very good result on the whole, taking into account the fact of the fluctuating attendance owing to climatic and geographical conditions.

280. Do you not think there is a certain amount of danger in employing a relative of the family in such schools, owing to the fact that her teaching duties may be neglected for household or domestic duties?—Yes, I do; but it is the lesser evil of a great many others.

281. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You do not approve of the indiscriminate establishment of these household schools?—No; there should be some limit.

282. If a limit were placed by the department, would it not save the Board a great deal of trouble, owing to pressure being brought to bear on them by householders to establish such schools?—Yes.

283. What would you consider a fair minimum before you would allow the establishment of such a school: would you say 10?—I do not think we can deal with the case unless you take into consideration the fact that the teachers are members of the family. I should be very sorry to allow any teacher, if he had to pay board and lodging out of the salary he was receiving, less than £60 a year.

284. In connection with the appointment at Kumara, you stated that the applicant had spent a number of years in the service of the Westland Board: would that entitle him to be considered a more efficient teacher than a teacher who had spent a considerable number of years in the service of any outside Board?—No.

285. Your Board does not encourage outsiders: your system is parochial?—No; absolutely not.

286. Do you not employ married women in the service of the Board?—We have two or three but we would not make any fresh appointment.

287. Do you expect the pupil-teachers, in the event of their being appointed, to teach sewing—I mean the female pupil-teachers?—Generally.

288. Where there is a sole male teacher there is no sewing taught?—No.

289. You do not consider a sewing-mistress any assistance to a sole teacher?—We very seldom make an appointment in the country schools.

290. *Mr. Hill.*] In these small schools where you have no Committee what kind of supervision have you?—We generally have what we term a "correspondent." The Board appoints a householder to make suggestions and recommendations.

291. Do you still employ correspondents when you establish these household schools?—No, I do not think we do.

292. Then, these schools are carried on without any kind of local supervision or control?—That is so.

293. You have no information about the conduct of those schools other than you obtain by the visit of your Inspector?—That is so.

294. You know nothing of the possibilities of conducting such schools according to the regulations?—Only this: if the Inspector sent in an adverse report we would be very much inclined to close the school.

295. Do you foster the giving of subsidies in your own districts by the residents themselves?—No.

296. You think that the Government should maintain those schools absolutely?—Not absolutely, for this reason: It must be borne in mind that the teacher, being a member of the family, lives in the house, and has her board and lodging free; and this is really a subsidy paid by the parents towards the education of the children in the house.

297. Then, in the case of an elder sister teaching, the family receives a subsidy through her teaching her brothers and sisters?—Yes, that is really the position.

298. These people have come to look upon it that the children should be educated, no matter where they reside?—Yes, they take up that stand.

299. The capitation grant from the Government of £5 in a school of 6 children would give £30: do you think that is a fair amount?—Yes, I do; and that is the point I want to emphasize, that any attempt to go further in the matter of capitation for those schools of 5 or 6 children must break down.

300. I see you have twenty-six schools, and on those twenty-six schools you only lose £154?—Yes; and that bears out my contention that those children are being taught now at a comparatively small cost to the colony, and taught fairly satisfactorily.

301. The suggested scale would greatly benefit you?—Yes, it would.

302. *The Chairman.*] You referred in commendatory terms to the aided or household schools?—Yes; I think the system is quite as satisfactory and quite as good as one could expect under the conditions existing here.

303. I understand you find no fault in a member of a household being employed to teach in those schools so long as the results are satisfactory?—I have not in my mind's eye any case in our district where the results have proved unsatisfactory.

A. J. Morton, B.A., Secretary of the Westland Education Board and Inspector of Schools, examined.

Mr. Morton: The Chairman and other members of the Board have placed before you very clearly the conditions obtaining in Westland, and therefore it will not be necessary for me to go over the same ground again. I simply wish to give my opinion that in the Education District of Westland we cannot reduce the number of small schools, because the agricultural conditions of the country will not allow of an amalgamation.

304. *Mr. Davidson.*] In connection with the staffing of the smaller schools, I find, in Westland, you allow one teacher to 35 pupils: is that staffing as liberal as that allowed in most of the education districts in New Zealand, and also as compared with the staffing allowed in similar schools in the Australian Colonies?—Yes.

305. Do you consider a teacher and pupil-teacher sufficient staffing in a school of from 35 to 50?—Yes, I think it is sufficient in itself. I may say that there is an objection to a pupil-teacher in that position on account of changes from one grade to another. It would be better to have a junior assistant than a pupil-teacher.

306. Would you favour the introduction of a certificated assistant at rather a higher average than that suggested in the proposed scale?—It is simply a question of expense and of expediency. I think if an assistant were allowed the average might be raised a little. I should prefer, on other grounds, to see an assistant at 36.

307. In Otago, for instance, the staffing allowed for a school between 50 and 100 is a headmaster and an assistant mistress; that, compared with South Australia, is found to be more liberal: have you heard that the efficiency of the teaching in such schools is below that in any other part of New Zealand?—No.

308. In the suggested scale the staffing proposed to be allowed in schools between 75 and 100 is a headmaster, an assistant, and a pupil-teacher: what is your opinion of that staffing?—It is the same as under the Westland scale.

309. The result to Otago in such schools would be very serious. For instance, I take the first school on the list—the Wharekuri School—the headmaster classified D1, though necessarily a com-

petent man, considering his certificate, would be reduced to the extent of £25 a year in salary. He is a man who has been in the service a very considerable time, and who is admitted to have done, and to be still doing, excellent work. In your opinion, can that school, with an attendance of 83, be efficiently worked by the present staff?—I should prefer to have a pupil-teacher at that grade as well. It is quite possible, by giving higher salaries, and by getting more experienced and skilful teachers, that the staffing would be sufficient.

310. Have you ever taught in such a school?—No.

311. Then, you speak of the difficulties from the point of view of an Inspector?—Yes.

312. If it can be shown that the staffing allowed in Otago is more liberal than that allowed in South Australia, and that the South Australian scale was drawn up by the late well-known Inspector of Schools, Mr. Hartley, would you consider that there was something to be said in favour of such a staff, seeing that in South Australia the staffing allowed in schools between 75 and 100 is the same as in Otago, and also bearing in mind that it was drawn up by the most admittedly competent man in Australasia?—Yes, provided the salaries are sufficient to secure efficient teachers.

313. In your opinion, do you think that medium-sized schools should have allotted to them such a salary as to induce men to go into the country to take charge of such schools, to be fairly satisfied, and to remain there for a considerable time?—Yes.

314. A good deal has been said about the prizes in the profession: would you make such schools carry a sufficiently large salary as to be looked upon as prizes by assistants in the city or suburban schools, or by the head teachers in similar schools?—Not exactly as prizes, but as schools they would be prepared to accept.

315. If a teacher was prepared to accept a school of that kind, and was satisfied to remain in it a considerable time, you think it would be in the interests of education?—Yes.

316. *Mr. Stewart.*] What do you think would be the effect of giving fairly large salaries at the top of the profession?—It would provide an inducement to men of the right class to join the profession and remain in it.

317. Do you think it would be wise to have a comparatively low maximum salary—say, £300?—No; I think that would be too low.

318. Do you think it would be wise to have salaries too much on one level throughout the scale?—No; you must pay salaries according to the importance of the work.

319. Do you think that differences in the gradation of the scale of payment has the effect of stimulating better work in the lower grades?—It might tend to have that effect.

320. And keep up the efficiency of the schools?—Yes.

321. Then, altogether, it would be in the public interest?—Yes.

322. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you favour a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

323. Do you consider teachers adequately remunerated on the whole?—No.

324. They would be better paid in other departments of the public service?—Yes.

325. How far do you consider this proposed scale will affect the Westland District?—With the exception of the assistants in the two large schools, it will mean an increase in the salaries.

326. With regard to staffing?—It will have very little effect, except in schools of from 36 to 50, where a mistress or junior assistant would be substituted for a pupil-teacher.

327. Do you consider a sole teacher can efficiently teach 36 pupils?—Yes.

328. Either a male or a female?—Yes.

329. Do you consider that there should be equal pay for equal work?—Up to a certain amount, yes.

330. Up to what number?—Up to the number a sole teacher would manage.

331. Do the School Committees and the Education Board in this district unduly favour the appointment of female applicants?—I would not like to say "unduly." They do favour the applications of females in the small schools on account of the sewing.

332. Is the Inspector of Schools consulted by the Education Board in this district with regard to the transfer of teachers?—Yes.

333. His recommendation is generally acted upon?—Yes; due consideration is given to his recommendations.

334. Do you not consider that the Westland Education Board is rather liberal in the establishment of these small household schools?—No; I have already said I do not see how they could be reduced by amalgamation.

335. Do you consider the teachers in outlandish districts in which the cost of living is higher should receive in consequence higher remuneration?—It would be the ideal to do so, but I do not think it is practicable.

336. Do you consider that any of the teachers would be prejudicially affected by the introduction of this proposed colonial scale?—No, except the assistants I mentioned.

337. You consider that the increase should be by units?—Yes.

338. Should the salaries be based on the quarterly returns or the yearly returns?—On the average for the whole year.

339. What do you consider should be the highest minimum certificate for a male teacher?—A C1 certificate.

340. And in the case of a female teacher?—A D1.

341. How would you propose to get over the difficulty, seeing that there are not training-colleges?—Either by sending pupil-teachers to the large centres, or, as a very bad substitute for that, having junior assistantships in one or two of the large schools, so that pupil-teachers would gain experience in those schools.

342. Do you favour the uniformity of pupil-teachers' examinations throughout the whole colony?—Yes.

343. Do you consider that the proposed salaries of pupil-teachers are inadequate?—No.

344. Do you consider that the amount which has been paid by the Westland Board is too low?—Yes; I prefer the suggested scale.

345. Do you favour the appointment of members of the family in the household schools?—In this district that is very often the only way in which we are able to secure a teacher. If it is objected to at all it should be forbidden absolutely.

346. Do you favour the Inspectors being placed under the control of the central department?—Yes.

347. Are you in favour of a superannuation scheme or retiring-allowance for teachers?—Yes.

348. Do you consider that it would be an advantage if the Grey and Westland Districts were amalgamated and one Inspector appointed for the districts?—I think it would be an advantage to have amalgamation.

349. Do you consider it is advisable to differentiate the syllabus-work required in small country schools to town schools?—In the very small schools, yes.

350. *Mr. Hogben.*] Could you furnish the Commission with a statement showing the expenditure of the Westland Board for the years 1898, 1899, and 1900, exclusive of teachers' salaries and allowances, &c.?—Yes; I have already prepared a statement, and now place it before the Commission [Exhibit 23].

351. Referring to the Hokitika and Kumara Schools, was not the Kumara School some time ago a District High School?—Yes.

352. Hokitika is the only District High School at the present time?—Yes.

353. Do you know the circular dealing with grants to district high schools?—Yes.

354. Would the capitation grant given in the circular do away with the difficulty in regard to the school?—Yes; it would enable the Board in that particular school to make up the deficiency in the salary of the assistant master.

355. What would be the capitation payable to your Board at £4 on 1,139?—£4,556.

356. What would be the amount payable to your Board for salaries under this proposed scale, as shown in the return [Exhibit 24] already handed in?—£4,384.

357. That would leave a balance for expenses of £172 if the £4 capitation grant were given?—Yes.

358. Do you think that sum would be enough to meet the expenses of the Board, exclusive of salaries—to pay for inspection, &c.?—Certainly not.

359. Would it be possible for the Board, if it received capitation at £4 a head, to pay salaries according to the proposed scale, and carry on its office-work?—No, it would not.

360. You say you consider the highest minimum certificate for a male teacher C1?—Yes.

361. Were you referring to a male head teacher?—Yes, of a primary school.

362. And in the case of a female you say a D1?—Yes.

363. Would that answer apply to separate boys' and girls' schools, as, say, in Wellington? If you had a girls' school of 400 pupils, would you require a lower certificate from the headmistress than you would require from the headmaster of a boys' school of an equivalent number—*i.e.*, 400?—Yes, I think so.

364. Why?—Because there is a greater supply of higher grades among the males than among the females, though many of the headmasters of large schools in the colony at the present time have only D1.

365. Why would you not put the masters at D1 as well as the mistresses?—Because there are more masters with higher certificates than females. I think it is easier for them to secure higher certificates.

366. Putting aside the question of salaries altogether, what is the ideal maximum number of pupils for one teacher with all the standards?—I think, about 30.

367. Taking every consideration into account, do you not think there is a natural limit to the number a teacher can teach effectively, however clever he may be?—It is very hard to say. I do not think any teacher should have more than 40 pupils with all standards, no matter how efficient that teacher may be.

368. Am I right in thinking that your reason for saying so is because a great deal depends on a child's power of receiving instruction, as well as on a teacher's capacity for imparting it?—Yes; and the necessity for the individual training of the children in our schools.

369. Is it not true that by increasing the number of pupils to a teacher you alter the character of the instruction given to the pupil, making it more of a mechanical kind?—Yes.

370. *Mr. Stewart.*] In relation to the staffing of these household schools, are you in favour of absolutely prohibiting the teaching of such schools by relatives of the family, such power to prohibit being given to the central department?—I would not go so far as that. Where it can be avoided there is no doubt it should be.

371. If you had a scale with a minimum rate of pay, would it not be practicable?—Yes.

372. In theory you are opposed to such a practice, but in certain cases you feel bound to modify your opinion?—Yes.

373. *The Chairman.*] Do you think it matters very much whether a member of the family teaches in those schools, or an outsider, so long as the results are satisfactory?—Good work is obtained from the teachers who are relatives or members of the family; but the objection is outside of the question of ability to teach. My experience is that the average work is good in those schools.

374. With reference to some of the large schools, do you think the difference between headmasters' work and the work of first assistants is so great that there should be the present huge difference in salary?—I think it is a question of degree. I certainly think that headmasters should be paid more on account of the responsibility of the work in connection with large schools, and the training of junior teachers.

375. Do you think there should be a difference amounting to almost double?—I should not say double; there should be a considerable difference, though it depends greatly on the size of the schools.

376. If the proposed scale is carried into effect, what will be the result so far as the Hokitika and Kumara Schools are concerned?—In that case the salaries would be too low for the assistants at those schools.

377. The first assistants' salaries would be reduced and the headmasters' salaries would be increased?—Yes.

378. Perhaps you would prefer not to express any further opinion on the subject?—I am prepared to say that I think the salaries of the assistants too low.

379. Much too low?—I think if they were fixed at £150 instead of £130 it would be nearer the proper amount.

380. Do you not think it would only make matters a great deal worse than at present if such an alteration as that were brought about?—I think that the assistants' work is important enough to warrant larger salaries.

381. Who are the underpaid teachers—teachers of small schools or the headmasters of large schools?—The head teachers of schools from 35 upwards, especially those between 35 and 100.

382. Is it not the case that the same amount of teaching-power is required in the moderate-sized schools as in the larger schools?—Each individual teacher may have as much class-teaching to do, but the headmasters in the larger schools have a great deal more work to do in the training of the junior teachers of the schools.

382A. They require to exercise the power of supervision?—Yes.

383. Do you think their duties are as arduous or more so than those of teachers in moderate-sized schools looking after all the standards?—I think, on the whole, their work is harder and more responsible. More time has to be given by them.

384. Are you of the opinion that a headmaster who has considerable experience in a school of about 100 is not capable of taking charge of a school of 200, 300, or 400?—He may be able to teach well either class of school.

385. Do you think it requires a man of equal ability to take charge of the small as well as the large school?—So far as methods of teaching are concerned, an equally good man is required in both. The headmaster of a large school needs qualities not found in a class-teacher. He needs to be a good organizer and a good director.

386. Have you ever known the headmaster of a small school when promoted to a large school fail in the undertaking?—It is possible it would happen, though I do not know of a case in point.

387. As the result of your experience, would you say that the head teacher of a school of from 70 to 100 pupils is not equal to the task of managing a school of double that number?—I do not think it necessarily follows. A teacher who was successful in a small school might have the qualities to conduct a large school, and the work, physically and mentally, may be just as arduous.

388. Provided that there was some test by means of which the qualities of teachers could be ascertained, would you be in favour of fixing salaries according to the teachers' capabilities rather than according to the size of the schools?—I do not think that is practicable. I think the only basis of payment is on the work a man has to do—the only practicable basis.

389. You would not give a poorly paid master an opportunity of showing his proficiency by putting him in charge of a large school?—I should like to see it very much.

390. If he proves that he was equal to the position, do you think he should be given a larger school?—It should be recorded in his favour, and he should be given an opportunity, when a vacancy occurs, of exercising the ability he has shown.

H. G. WAKE, B.A., Headmaster of the Hokitika District High School, examined.

Mr. Wake: I have been deputed, as president of the Institute, to bring before this Commission several important matters which we would like looked into. The secretary of the Institute will deal with several matters, but it has fallen to my lot to discuss chiefly the workings of the district high schools. A resolution was passed by the Institute a few days ago that the attention of the Commission should be drawn to the inadequate staffing of the district high schools throughout the colony, resulting in serious overwork. I would like to inform the Commission that I have in my mind's eye not the Hokitika District High School particularly, but district high schools generally. I was engaged for several years in the Waimate District High School. There were 36 pupils, and this Commission will understand that in a school of that sort there are many divisions necessary. As a matter of fact, there were no less than five divisions, to do the work of which the only extra staffing allowed was one teacher. You will therefore see how arduous the duties must have been in conducting that school. It fell to my lot to do the extra work, and for three years I worked every night two and three hours extra, every Saturday, and frequently holidays. Since I have been here the Board has been most liberal in the treatment of the District High School. There are 27 pupils, and they are divided into four classes in many subjects. To carry on the work of this school there are two teachers, myself and an assistant. The assistant is only about two-thirds of her time in the secondary class, and I myself have to periodically examine the primary department, while, in addition, we have to prepare pupils for Civil Service examinations and for matriculation. Last year we sent up and passed eight for the Civil Service and three for matriculation, and they wish to be put through in two years after passing Standard VI., which means an enormous amount of work, and the staff is inadequate to cope with it. In the case of the Whangarei High School there are 31 pupils—only 4 more than I have—and they have three on the staff, whereas here, as you might say, we have only one and a half. I

would also like to point out the fact that outside the secondary class there is the work of the primary department, the training of pupil-teachers, of which we have three. The new regulations insist that headmasters shall periodically examine their schools; and an Inspector would take well into a week to do so, and every month I have to examine, while at the same time the work of the secondary class is going on. You will understand that I feel very strongly on the subject. There are so many branches to be taken in the secondary class. At the present time we are dealing with no less than nine branches, and if the work of district high schools is to be carried on successfully I think the whole question must be looked into. At present it is simply a system of "sweating," though hitherto it has been unavoidable. Were the District High School separated to-morrow from the primary school there would no doubt be two or three teachers put in. The Institute thinks that the payment of teachers on average attendance is not the best plan. In a country such as this there are climatic conditions which necessarily interfere with the attendance, and it is not right that the teachers should have to bear the brunt of bad attendance, and that their salaries should suffer on that account. A short time ago one of the country schools here was threatened with scarlet fever, and for three months the attendance was lessened by a half; accordingly the teacher's salary suffered. A better plan would be to pay on the roll-number, and we feel it would be more righteous to do so. In conclusion, I heartily indorse the proposed increase to pupil-teachers. My experience has been that they do excellent work, and I think the proposed increase a step in the right direction, for they undoubtedly deserve every penny which is proposed to be allotted to them. In regard to the question of the payment of first assistants in schools of from 175 to 225, and from 225 to 250, the Institute thinks that the first assistants do not receive sufficient salary, nor does the Institute think that the salary of the second assistants is adequate. It is demanded that he or she should have a D3 certificate. We are of the opinion, considering the number of years a teacher must devote in order to gain a D certificate, that a salary of £80 a year is inadequate, and that £2 per week is not too much to ask.

391. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You do not suggest what the staffing should be in a district high school?—It is a big question; and I am not prepared, on the spur of the moment, to make any suggestion other than that a district high school should be considered equally with an ordinary high school. My experience is that they do excellent work, and that they merit equal staffing.

392. Perhaps you are not aware that we are precluded from considering high schools altogether. Do you think that the scope of this inquiry should include the proper treatment of high schools?—Yes, I do.

393. You suggest that the secondary classes of district high schools should be staffed as ordinary high schools?—I think they should be staffed better than they are at present.

394. If a secondary class is staffed as you think it should be, would you consider that one of the tests of the efficiency of work should be the number of passes in the Civil Service Examination?—I think it is a very good test. It depends, however, on the pupils themselves, whether they enter or not.

395. If the schools were fully staffed, would you expect annually a certain number to secure passes in the Civil Service?—Yes.

396. How many did you say had obtained passes in your school last year?—Eight passed, and one obtained nineteenth position for the colony.

397. A good many matriculated?—Yes.

398. Do you think two years is too short a period, after a boy has passed the Sixth Standard, in which to pass the Civil Service?—Yes.

399. Were any of your successful candidates students of more than two years?—Some had attended two years, and some three. One boy matriculated in two years.

400. Would you consider that in three years in a well-conducted district high school a large percentage should pass the Civil Service Examination?—Yes.

401. Referring to primary schools, how many pupils do you think a sole teacher could be intrusted with in order to teach them efficiently?—I think that a teacher, to do his work effectively and systematically, should not have more than 40 or 45.

402. Do you think that would be a fair number?—Yes.

403. Do you think it would be better to reduce the salaries of those teachers and add staff assistance, or to continue as they are and pay more adequate salaries—I refer particularly to the Otago schools?—I could hardly tell without having a specified school in view.

404. You say that salaries should be paid on the roll-number, and not on the average attendance: would you confine that to special districts or to the whole colony?—To the whole colony. I do not think it fair that teachers should be penalised because children do not appreciate the advantage of education.

405. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is your experience as a primary-school teacher?—I was trained in the Timaru Main School. I think I was eleven years there. I was three years as first assistant at the Waimate District High School, and for the last two years I have been in my present position.

406. You have never taught, as head-teacher, in any school with an average attendance under 100?—No.

407. *Mr. Stewart.*] You have considered the scale of staff and salaries?—Not thoroughly.

408. Did you notice that there was a difference in the salaries of schools from 225 to 250, as between £176 and £186?—Yes.

409. Would you be in favour of paying the headmasters and the assistants of those schools exactly the same salary?—I think there should be an increase in salary as the work, and consequently the attendance, increases.

410. If the school increased to 300, would you pay larger salaries?—Yes.

411. If the school increased to 500, would you still increase the salaries?—Yes, but not by such big leaps.

412. Is there anything besides teaching ability required by the headmaster of a large school? —Most emphatically. He should be able to train his assistants, and should also have administrative ability to organize his school.

413. Do you think that teachers who are eminently successful in schools up to 60 are not so successfully able to manage larger schools?—I have never heard of such a case.

414. Do you think the inherent qualities for the two positions are very different?—Yes.

415. What would be the effect if there were no prizes in the profession?—I think it would tend to lessen emulation and the doing of good work, and that the teachers would leave the profession.

416. Have you known teachers to leave the profession?—Yes, several.

417. For what reason?—I may say my brother left the profession after being entirely successful. He left on account of his health breaking down, caused by overwork.

418. Have you known cases where teachers have left the service because there was not sufficient scope for them?—No, I cannot say I have.

419. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Are you a member of the Teachers' Institute?—Yes.

420. Has the Institute held a meeting in order to consider this proposed scale of staff and salaries since they received a copy?—Yes, a meeting was held, but the scale was only considered in a perfunctory manner.

421. Your opinion is that it would be a great improvement on the state of affairs that obtains in this district?—Yes.

422. Do you consider that the teachers in this district are overworked according to the staffing allowed by the Board?—Not in the primary schools.

423. Are you fairly well acquainted with the staffing of schools in other educational districts? —Yes.

424. Do you consider in any of the districts that the teachers have too much to do?—Yes, I do.

425. Can you name any?—I think South Canterbury is a marked example.

426. In Southland, for instance, a pupil-teacher is not granted until the average attendance is 45: do you consider that too high?—Yes.

427. Do you not consider that a teacher would prefer to teach 45 and get a fair salary rather than teach 36 and get a reduced salary, with extra assistance?—I think a teacher should receive assistance and a fair salary.

428. You would be in favour of increasing the capitation grant from the Government?—Yes.

429. To what extent?—So far that every man would get a fair remuneration for the work he did.

430. Is it not a fact that with the freedom of classification and the grouping of the various classes a teacher can teach efficiently more in country schools than was the case a few years back?—My experience is that the freedom of classification increases the work, from the teachers' point of view.

431. Do you think it increases the responsibility?—Yes.

432. Do you consider that a teacher in a country school of 40 pupils, with all standards, has heavier work to perform than a class-teacher—an assistant—in a large town school with a class of 50 or 60?—The work is of a different type. The teacher in a country school of 40 has not the same tax on him, so far as administrative control is concerned. The teacher in the town school needs to be a better disciplinarian.

433. You consider that in both cases the remuneration should be about equal?—Yes; I do not think there should be a great difference.

434. Are you in favour of a differentiation in the syllabus-work, so as to allow a lower standard of work in country schools from that of town schools?—Yes.

435. Do you consider the Inspectors should be placed under the control of the central department?—Yes.

436. Do you think it would tend to uniformity of inspection and the assignment of marks?—Yes.

437. Do you find the teachers in this district applying for positions under other Education Boards are boycotted?—It is a common practice.

438. Does the Westland Board adopt the same practice?—Not to my knowledge.

439. Do you consider that we should, as far as possible, adopt the principle of equal pay for equal work with regard to the salaries of male and female teachers?—Yes, provided the work is equal.

440. Up to what number can a female sole teacher teach as efficiently as a male: do you think she could teach up to 35?—Yes.

441. Then, up to that number you would be in favour of a female teacher receiving the same salary as a male teacher?—It would depend on the pupils. On the whole, I should say Yes.

442. Is any difficulty experienced in this district in obtaining cetificated teachers?—Not that I am aware of.

443. Is the assignment of marks by Inspectors towards the improvement of teachers' certificates working satisfactorily in this district?—I have every reason to believe so.

444. Do you approve of a superannuation scheme or retiring-allowance for teachers?—Yes, I think so.

445. Do you consider that the examinations of teachers should be conducted by the Education Department irrespective of the university?—I do not see any reason why it should not be. I have not looked into the matter. I should imagine it would be more beneficial to the teachers.

446. Do you consider that candidates should be allowed to qualify for Class D through the matriculation?—Yes, I see no reason why it should not be. I think that the questions in Class D and the matriculation are very much of the same standard.

447. What do you consider should be the lowest minimum certificate required by a male or a female teacher required in a school of from 36 to 40?—I should think, a D2 or an E1.

448. What do you consider should be the highest minimum certificate for the headmaster of the largest school we have?—A C1, I think, should fit any master for any school.

449. And the same for a female?—I think so.

450. What would you expect in the District High School?—There should be a graduate with a B1 or an A1.

451. *Mr. Hill.*] Approximately, what is the present average attendance of your school?—Between 230 and 240.

452. What is your staff at the present time?—Eight—headmaster, four assistants, and three pupil-teachers.

453. You have noticed the staffing under the proposed scale?—Yes.

454. You would have then a headmaster, three assistants, and three pupil-teachers?—Yes.

455. That would be the staffing for the primary school?—Yes.

456. What is the difference between this staffing as proposed and the present staffing?—Merely an assistant.

457. A mistress?—Yes.

458. Then, as your school is constituted a District High School, you simply have the difference between the staffing recognised under the proposed scale of one female assistant?—Yes.

459. What salary does she receive?—£125.

460. Then, your District High School is carried on at a cost of £125?—The rector gets extra.

461. Under the scale what would you get?—£250 or £260.

462. What is your present salary?—£270.

463. Then, the difference between what you receive as a primary-school teacher and as a secondary-school teacher is about £10 a year?—Yes.

464. You make complaint that it is unfair to expect so much from the headmaster?—Yes.

465. Do you not think your school would be better organized and more efficiently taught in many ways if you could give more time for supervision, and had more assistance in the whole of the secondary work?—Yes.

466. Suppose an assistant master were to be appointed in conformity with the suggestions the department has issued, do you think it would be better for the well-being of your school?—I think it would be very beneficial.

467. You feel that the present arrangements make it extremely difficult for you to carry on satisfactorily?—Yes, very difficult.

468. Inasmuch as you have the secondary and primary work to control?—Yes.

469. What is the maximum number one of your certificated teachers could manage?—I see no reason why a properly certificated teacher could not teach up to 50, although I think 40 would be better.

470. Do you think it is more difficult to teach a school of 35 with all standards than a single standard class of 50 pupils?—Yes.

471. Would you pay more salary to the teacher of the school of 35 in consequence?—Yes.

472. If a scale were drawn up whereby you could dispense with pupil-teachers and substitute trained assistants, do you think it would tend to the efficiency of schools?—Yes.

473. Do you think you could carry on your school with greater efficiency if you had assistants instead of pupil-teachers?—I think so. Of course, it depends upon the assistants very largely.

474. I am assuming trained assistants?—There are some pupil-teachers I prefer to assistants. I have had cases where I would prefer a second-year pupil-teacher to an assistant.

475. Supposing your school was staffed by a headmaster, first assistant, and other junior assistants, do you think that staffing would be more efficient than under your present arrangements?—Yes.

476. In Standards I., II., III., and IV. the responsibilities of the teachers are almost identical: would you pay them the same salary, or nearly so?—I would be inclined to give the Fourth Standard a somewhat higher salary than the teacher of Standard I.

477. But would you make as wide a difference as is proposed under the suggested scale?—I think the difference between an assistant receiving £80 and the second assistant receiving £140 is a little too great.

478. Do your assistant mistresses do work of a similar character to the assistant masters?—I have only one assistant master.

479. Supposing you were to allot the work in your school, and you had two assistant mistresses and two assistant masters, would you expect the assistant mistresses to be able to take the same classes as the assistant masters?—Yes.

480. You would expect the same standard of efficiency?—Yes.

481. You would like the assistant mistresses to get as high a classification as possible?—Yes.

482. Do you pay an assistant mistress the same salary as an assistant master?—No; the salaries differ.

483. Do you think she should receive the same salary for the same class of work?—Yes; of course, in a large school the first assistant master and the first assistant mistress would not do the same work.

484. *Mr. Hogben.*] There is no necessity to interfere with the primary-school salaries; the District High School is not within the scope of the Commission except so far as it affects the salaries in the primary school. You stated that the number of teachers at the Whangarei High School was three?—Yes.

485. Will you enumerate the teachers?—Headmaster, assistant, and female junior assistant during the last, second, and third terms of the year.

486. What is the total amount of salaries paid to the Whangarei High School?—£280.
487. Have you a copy of the District High School circular?—No, I have not.
488. I will give you one. Will you look at section 3, as to separate provision for staffing? You see, in a district high school there is to be separate provision for staffing?—Yes.
489. The rest of the school to be staffed equally with any other primary school?—Yes.
490. Will you refer to sections 5, 6, and 7? What is the total amount, over and above the capitation, that may be paid for any pupil in a district high school: is it not £6?—Yes.
491. What have you besides to each district?—£30.
492. How many pupils have you in the District High School?—27.
493. At £6 that would give you?—£162.
494. And the £30 for the school itself?—£192.
495. How much do you get from the High School Board?—£100.
496. That makes a total amount available of how much?—£292.
497. And the expenditure in connection with the Whangarei District High School was?—£280.
498. There would be rather more than equal facilities for paying high-school salaries in Hokitika than in the Whangarei School, with four more pupils?—That is so.
499. You are responsible for the organization here, are you not?—Yes.
500. If you got something extra you would not expect it should necessarily interfere with the primary-school salaries?—Not at all.
501. Generally speaking, you prefer to have a smaller number of assistants than a larger number of pupil-teachers?—If I was not so tied down to secondary work, and was able to train my own pupil-teachers, my preference for assistants would not be so decided, for I find that pupil-teachers do excellent work.
502. Would there be any difficulty in your present buildings in working with a smaller staff?—There would be; the rooms are hardly large enough to take two classes.
503. Then, the question of the substitution of pupil-teachers would be affected by the convenience of the buildings?—Yes.
504. In some districts it might be desirable to allow the alternative, you think?—I think so.
505. *The Chairman.*] How long has the District High School been in existence?—I do not know.
506. How long have you been in charge of the District High School?—Just over two years.
507. Are those 27 pupils who constitute the secondary school taught exclusively by yourself?—I have a female assistant.
508. What salary does she receive?—£125.
509. How do you divide your time between the primary and the secondary school?—I give three-fourths, if not seven-eighths, of my time to the High School; perhaps three-fourths would be nearer.
510. You find the work in connection with the primary and secondary school very arduous?—Yes.
511. Do you not think it would be advantageous if you simply had the secondary work to attend to?—It would be, decidedly, from my point of view, but it would be more expensive in the working of the school.
512. You say they are instructed in nine subjects?—Yes.
513. Seeing that a considerable amount of your time is devoted to the High School, do you consider the primary-school children are receiving fair treatment, when you take into consideration also that your assistant mistress also has high-school duties?—Yes; the primary school is not neglected in any way.
514. Then, you are of opinion that the secondary class is not conducted at the expense of the primary-school children?—No; rather say it is conducted at the expense of the teachers.
515. Is it not an anomaly that the headmaster of a primary school should so devote a very large portion of his time to secondary work?—The school is under a different footing from the primary schools generally.
516. Who takes charge of the upper standards in the primary school when you are absent?—The first assistant.
517. He has nothing to do with the High School?—Nothing whatever.
518. You say you consider a teacher should be paid according to the roll-attendance rather than the average attendance?—Yes, I think so.
519. I presume the climate here affects the attendance very much?—Yes; especially in the country districts.
520. You are of opinion that if the attendance is irregular the parents rather than the teachers should be held responsible?—Most decidedly.

J. J. Henderson, Headmaster, Arahura Road School, examined.

Mr. Henderson: I propose to read certain resolutions passed by the Westland Branch of the Educational Institute, and afterwards to hand them in as an exhibit. [Resolutions read—Exhibit 25.]
521. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] What are the articles in this district so much in excess of the prices paid in the Otago and Wellington Districts?—I may say that the evidence we went upon in that respect was the evidence given before the Police Commission with reference to their salaries on the Coast, and it was proved before the Commission that the expense of living on the Coast was between 30 and 40 per cent. higher than between, say, Auckland and Christchurch.
522. Was there a comparative statement worked out in regard to all the details between east and west?—Yes; the usual articles of daily consumption were taken as factors in determining it.
523. You say it is in the report of the Police Commission?—Yes.

524. Have you studied the proposed scale?—It only reached me on Friday last, and I have had very little time.

525. What salary do you receive?—£129.

526. What assistance have you?—A pupil-teacher, though she ranks as an assistant.

527. What salary does she receive?—£42.

528. What number of children do you consider sufficient to give to a male teacher in a school such as yours?—I have all the Standards from III. to VII. It is not so much the number in a standard as compared with the fact of having all the standards; I could as easily teach 60 as 30.

529. With the same assistance?—Yes.

530. You wish to see a general building-up of the system of paying salaries?—Yes.

531. You do not want your schools in this district to benefit at the expense of schools in other districts?—No.

532. You do not consider a teacher in a school of 44 is too highly remunerated at a salary of £154 a year?—No, certainly not; and I think I voice the sentiments of all the other teachers.

533. Would you prefer to teach a school with an assistant and to receive a fair salary rather than have an increased staff and a decreased salary?—Yes; I would only require one assistant in such a school as that.

534. *Mr. Davidson.*] Generally speaking, what has been your teaching experience?—I have been teaching for a great number of years. I was an assistant master in model schools in Ireland, and I was the headmaster of a large diocesan school in Ireland.

535. Have you noticed in the suggested scale what an assistant teacher is given when the average attendance of a school reaches 36?—Yes.

536. In a school of 36 children there would be two certificated teachers, or an average of 18 children per teacher: do you think that staffing is too liberal?—Yes.

537. Can you tell me what the average attendance is in, say, Southland before a certificated assistant is added to the staff of a school?—I do not know.

538. I would like you to notice these figures: In Southland I find a certificated assistant is not added to the staff until the attendance reaches 75; in Otago, 50; in Wellington, 76; in Hawke's Bay, 81; in South Canterbury, 41; in Victoria, 75; in New South Wales, 70; in South Australia, 75; in Westland, 50. You will notice that, according to those figures, the staffing allowed in Otago is more liberal than in any of the Australian Colonies and the other school districts of New Zealand, with the exception of North and South Canterbury?—Yes.

539. Were you aware of that?—I had not studied the figures.

540. In South Canterbury, where a certificated teacher is allowed when the average attendance reaches 41, the salary paid to the assistant is £60 a year: is that a sufficiently high salary for any certificated teacher?—Certainly not.

541. Then, if the effect of introducing a certificated teacher in a school with an average attendance of 36 would be to materially reduce the salaries in districts where the staffing is already sufficiently liberal, do you think it advisable that such a step should be taken?—An assistant is not required in a school of 36.

542. Have you noticed that the minimum salary paid to a male assistant is £80 under the proposed scale?—Yes.

543. Do you consider £80 a sufficient salary for a teacher who has spent five or more years in hard study?—Most decidedly not.

544. Are you aware that the minimum salary in Victoria or South Australia is £100?—I was not aware of it.

545. Do you consider a headmaster and a certificated mistress sufficiently liberal staffing for a school of 85?—Yes, I do.

546. Then, a suggested scale that would allow additional assistance in the form of a pupil-teacher, but would reduce the head-teacher's salary by £25 a year, in your opinion is not advisable?—Certainly not.

547. *Mr. Stewart.*] Are you in favour of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries?—Yes.

548. What salary are you receiving at the present time?—£129.

549. What is the average attendance at your school?—42.

550. Under the suggested scale you would receive an increase of how much?—£24 a year.

551. You have an assistant?—Yes.

552. Would she benefit under the suggested scale?—Yes.

553. If you look at the suggested scale you will notice that in the different-sized schools running from an attendance of 14 up to 1,000 children the salaries of the teachers gradually increase in each grade: do you think it is in the interests of education and emulation among the teachers that this should be so?—Yes. I think all the schools should be open to any teacher, no matter what district that teacher may come from, in order that he or she may look forward to obtaining one of the higher positions.

554. You are of opinion that the promotions and general managements of the staff should be vested in some central authority?—Yes. I voice the feeling of seven-eighths of the teachers when I say that the appointment, removal, and dismissal of teachers should be entirely in the hands of the department, and that the payment of the salaries should come, as at present, through the Boards.

555. Do you not think that there should be some consultation of local opinion up to a certain point, or do you think the central authority should have the absolute power?—I think there should be some local influence, but I have not looked at it in that light.

556. Do you think it possible that teachers might succeed in one grade of school, but not in another?—It depends upon the training of the teachers. If a teacher is trained in a large school, and is then sent to take charge of a small school, that teacher would be competent to again take up the work of a large school.

557. Are you of opinion that the salaries paid to female teachers in your district are below what they should be?—Yes.

558. Do you think the salaries as set forth in the suggested scale are satisfactory for female teachers?—They are entirely satisfactory from no point of view. They are much too low.

559. *Mr. Luke.*] One of your objections against the proposed colonial scale is that the salaries there quoted are in some instances below the salaries paid in other education districts, such as Otago, for instance?—Yes.

560. You are of opinion that the longer a man teaches the less salary he gets?—That is our experience in Westland. Fourteen years ago I was appointed to the school I am in at present, at an advertised salary of £140. For some years I received that salary, but now, with the same average attendance as then, I am receiving a salary of £129 and a few shillings.

561. *Mr. Hill.*] Have you a residence?—Yes.

562. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Are teachers in this education district boycotted when applying for positions under other Education Boards?—Yes.

563. Do you think that is a satisfactory state of affairs?—No.

564. How came it about that certain reductions were made by the Westland Education Board: was it not on account of the Board establishing so many household schools?—We were consulted on the question of reduction, and asked whether we would agree to a 5½-per-cent. reduction or a diminution of the staff, and we agreed to the 5½-per-cent. reduction. Later on 6¾ per cent. was the reduction taken on salaries over £140.

565. Do you consider the Inspectors should be placed under the control of the central department?—Not unless the teachers are.

566. In the Westland Education District would the teachers prefer to do the same work as they are doing at present and receive fair and reasonable remuneration, or would they like an increased staffing and reduced pay?—The attendances at the schools are so poor that I do not think the teachers could get less.

567. Do you consider the work of a country teacher with all standards entails greater hardship on a teacher than the work of an assistant taking one large class in a town school?—The country teacher with all the standards is far harder worked than the class-teacher.

568. How many pupils have you in Standard VII.?—Two.

569. How many in Standard VI.?—Four.

570. Do you not group the standards?—Yes, as much as possible.

571. Could you not manage your school yourself without any assistance?—No, I could not.

572. Then, what is your opinion of the teachers in Southland, who take all standards in a school up to 45 and do not complain about it?—They are of a different race altogether.

573. *Mr. Hill.*] Would you suggest that the salaries should be based on the roll-number, and not on the average attendance?—Yes.

574. Do you not think such a system would be liable to great abuse?—So people say; but it was never proved to me that it would be.

575. Supposing you were to allow names to be kept on the register when the children had been absent three weeks or a month, do you think that would be a fair way of estimating the salaries of teachers?—According to the way our registers are kept in this district, with the concurrence and knowledge of our Inspector, a pupil's name can be left on the roll for half a quarter. I do not see, myself, that there is any greater chance of cheating if you pay on the roll-number than if you pay on the average attendance.

576. Would you regard a system of colonial classification as essential?—Yes.

577. Would you approve of a separate department and a separate degree for teachers, so that it would be as difficult for a graduate to obtain that degree as it would be for a teacher to obtain a graduate's degree?—Yes, I think so.

578. *Mr. Hogben.*] You stated that, in your opinion, a teacher at 36 does not need an assistant: do you think a teacher at 41 needs an assistant?—There should be a little assistance. I consider 40 pupils enough for a teacher without assistance.

579. You would not go beyond 40?—No.

580. *The Chairman.*] You approve of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

581. You do not approve of reducing any of the salaries?—No.

582. You think there should be an all-round increase?—Yes; there should be a levelling-up, and not a levelling-down.

583. You are not in favour of having teachers equally paid in different districts for the same class of work?—Yes, I am, decidedly.

584. But you would have a greater building-up in one district than another?—Yes.

585. The profession generally, in your opinion, is underpaid?—Yes; it is underpaid in this district compared with manual labour.

586. Is it not owing to the fact that there are so many females available for the work who, of course, could not undertake manual work?—Then, I say, it is taking a mean advantage of them on the part of the State by paying them small salaries.

587. You state your attendance is 43?—Yes. The attendance is bad; there are over 50 on the roll.

588. If you had a school of double that number would you consider you were overworked —No.

589. Then, you consider the headmaster of a school of between 40 and 50 pupils should be as well qualified as the headmaster of a school of double that number?—Yes, decidedly. I think, in the interests of the teaching profession, the schools should be graded.

590. You are not of the opinion that a headmaster should be paid according to the average attendance?—No; as I said, he should be paid according to his roll-number. He is obliged to

teach all the pupils on his roll, and is responsible for their education, and he should be paid for it. It has been suggested that there might be fraud under such a system, but I think that is an unworthy statement; I believe the teachers are incapable of fraud.

591. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] All of them?—Yes; of course, there may be a black sheep in the flock, but my opinion is it is quite as easy to perpetrate fraud by paying on the average attendance.

592. *The Chairman.*] You do not say that teachers are infallible?—I mean as a class.

593. You would prefer to see appointments made by the department rather than by the Boards?—Yes, for the reason that they would know the teachers better. There should be no such thing as handing in testimonials as to character, and certificates. It should be, as in the Old Country, a "Model School System."

594. Do you think the central department in Wellington would know the capabilities and general conduct of teachers as well as a School Committee, or the Inspector of an Education Board?—Yes, I think so. There is only one national education system and one National Board in the whole of Ireland—where, of course, there are a great many more schools than in New Zealand—and in one department, the Model School System, you can get everything connected with a teacher by application at the head office.

595. What is your opinion with regard to the payment of salaries to pupil-teachers: do you think they are sufficiently remunerated?—No, I certainly do not.

Miss W. Aitken, Assistant, Hokitika District High School, examined.

Miss Aitken: I would like to draw the attention of the Commission to the great inequality in the salaries paid to male and female teachers for the same class of work. It seems to me that the female teachers are expected to possess the same qualifications as male teachers, and, such being the case, it is only right that they should be paid an equal salary. Under the proposed scale a first assistant, if a male, is to receive a salary of £130 a year, while a female assistant for the same work receives £105. Why is her work valued at £25 less? It is acknowledged that the work of female teachers is better than the work of male teachers. A female teacher has more control; she is a better disciplinarian than the male. In the case of the next assistant, if a male he is to receive £100 a year, while the female assistant receives £90. In this case her work is only valued at £10 less. In the case of the third assistants a male and female receive £80 a year each. What suddenly makes their work worth the same salary in this grade if it is not worth the same salary in the higher grades? I think that is a point that wants explanation. There are a great many female teachers in the service at the present time, and I think it is only right that they should be encouraged. I think they employ their money to as great an advantage as men. On page 5 of the proposed scale there is a note to the effect that in mixed schools with an attendance of from 36 to 250, if the head-teacher be a master, the first assistant must be a mistress, and *vice versâ*. I think this is an anomaly according to the salaries to be paid under the suggested scale. I think to propose to pay a female teacher under the scale £80 an insult, considering the work she has to do after going through her pupil-teachership course. I speak from experience, because this is the position I am fulfilling myself at the present time. I have had 12½ years' teaching experience; I had control of a country school at a salary of £120 a year, and now, on coming into a town school, I am paid a salary of £80. It is not as though I taught only one class, for I teach various subjects in other classes.

596. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you teach sewing?—Yes. I would like to say that a witness this morning, in his remarks, said he considered that male teachers exercised more control than female teachers; I wish to contradict that statement emphatically.

597. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You occupy the position of second assistant, do you not?—Yes.

598. You are of opinion that the cost of living is as great to a female as to a male?—Yes.

599. Is it not more so in the case of a single woman than a single man?—I would not say that. I should say it was about equal; but if you consider fashions it is more so in the case of women.

600. It would cost a woman more a year for dress than a man?—Yes.

601. Speaking in regard to the question of control, up to what size of schools do you consider females can exercise the same control as male teachers?—I should say, any size of school. If a female can exercise as much control in a small school, it is my opinion she can as efficiently control a large school.

602. You think it depends on the individual power of the teacher rather than of the sex?—Yes.

603. *Mr. Davidson.*] You are of opinion that the disparity between the salaries paid to male and female teachers in New Zealand is too great?—Yes.

604. Are you not of opinion that in many cases, if there was an equality in salary and positions were thrown open to either sex, it would mean the pushing-out of females altogether?—No, I do not.

605. If the salaries paid to male and female teachers were equal, and School Committees had the option of choosing between the sexes, do you think they would prefer to take male teachers where they now take female teachers owing to the fact of paying lesser salaries?—I do not think so; I think they would prefer female teachers.

606. *Mr. Stewart.*] You stated you were in charge of a country school for some time?—Yes.

607. What was the size of the school?—When I first went there the attendance was 25, but within two years it ran up to 54, and remained at that for some time; now it is only 21.

608. May I ask what led to your transfer to the Hokitika School?—I had been there many years, and I saw no other opening.

609. You suffered a reduction in salary?—Yes.

610. With regard to the note in the proposed scale on page 5, as to its being compulsory for a male and female in the matter of first assistants to be alternative, would you prefer that note should be left out, or that it should stand as it is?—I do not exactly understand it in reference to schools like those of Hokitika and Kumara.

611. Do you think the teachers as a whole would prefer such a note in the scale, or that they should be taken on their merits?—Taken on their merits.

612. Do you think, for example, in Westland, that a sufficient number of male teachers could be found to take up all the positions?—I have my doubts about them being found in Westland. There seem to be very few male teachers.

613. *Mr. Hogben.*] Have you compared the suggested scale, so far as the salaries of female teachers are concerned, with the salaries paid to females under existing scales?—I have not had a proper opportunity, as we received this suggested scale only on Friday.

614. Then, you expressed an opinion in regard to certain salaries although you only received a copy of the suggested scale on Friday?—There is one thing I did notice, and that is that the first assistant mistress in a school like Hokitika under the old regulations receives a salary of £115, but under the suggested scale would receive only £105.

615. Do you think it is absolutely essential that a teacher should be obtained worth more than £105?—I think the teacher in the position is worth more than £105. I think she should receive a better salary.

616. All your arguments are based upon these particular examples taken from one district, are they not?—I do not know of any others.

617. Then, it is not a general comparison, as you instance isolated cases?—Yes.

618. You say that you cannot see why a male should be paid £130 and a female £105?—Yes, when they occupy similar positions.

619. In the average number of cases which has more persons dependent on them—the male wage-earner or the female wage-earner?—I would like to find out how many of the female wage-earners have mothers dependent on them.

620. Yes, that is recognised; but on the average who has more dependent on them?—It depends on whether a man does his duty.

621. I mean, speaking as a matter of common experience?—I think the circumstances are about equal.

622. Is all the rest of your evidence founded on similar notions?—I do not think so. You want teachers to teach satisfactorily, and surely you are not supposed to go into the details as to how many may be dependent on teachers.

623. You do not think we should consider how many a wage-earner has dependent on him?—No, I do not think so.

624. *The Chairman.*] You are of opinion that there should be equal pay for equal work?—Yes.

625. And that in certain positions in schools female teachers should be more adequately remunerated?—Yes.

WILLIAM D. MACKAY, Headmaster of the Woodstock School, examined.

626. *The Chairman.*] Have you considered the proposed colonial scale of staff and salaries: you have seen it?—Yes. I do not know that I need take up the time of the Commission at any great length, though there is one small matter that I would like to refer to, and one that seems to have been lost sight of. I refer to a class of very important schools—the moderate-sized schools. I am of the opinion that the salaries paid to head-teachers in schools of this description, from 75 upwards, very inadequate. I think that those schools are of great importance in the country, and play such an important part in the welfare of the country that the men in charge of them should be capable men, of personal individuality, and that they should be paid an adequate salary, so that the assistant masters in the larger schools would be able to work into such schools and bring their personality to bear upon them.

627. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is the average attendance of your school at the present time?—75.

628. Has it ever reached anything approaching 85?—Yes; for years it was about 85, but owing to the establishment of a Catholic school the attendance went down.

629. What is the staffing?—Headmaster, one assistant, and one pupil-teacher.

630. Do you think it would be possible to work your school satisfactorily with a headmaster and a competent female assistant?—Yes, I do.

631. In that case there would be a saving of money, assuming that your pupil-teacher was paid £33 a year?—Yes.

632. *Mr. Stewart.*] Are you in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Most emphatically.

633. *Mr. Luke.*] What is the name of your school?—The Woodstock School.

634. *Mr. Hill.*] What is your classification?—D1.

635. What is the classification of your assistant mistress?—E1.

636. What salary are you receiving?—£149.

637. Are you aware what salary you would be paid under the proposed scale?—Yes; £175.

638. Then, you would be considerably benefited?—Yes; of course, in addition to a salary of £149, I have a residence.

639. *Mr. Davidson.*] What did you say your salary would be under the suggested scale?—£175.

640. I think you are wrong, are you not?—The Inspector-General says £174.

641. *Mr. Stewart.*] What salary does your assistant mistress receive?—£75.

642. *Mr. Hill.*] What is your opinion as to the system of classification: do you think it should be as difficult for a teacher to obtain a graduate's degree as for a graduate to obtain a teacher's degree?—Yes; I think teachers should be compelled to study mental science.

643. *Mr. Hogben.*] What do you mean by a teacher's degree?—I mean a special degree in connection with the science of teaching.

644. What subjects would you take?—Various subjects.

645. How would you make up six subjects?—I have not gone into that.

646. Then, you answered the question without thinking?—I have not thought of the subjects.

647. Would you give a degree in pedagogy on a lower plane?—Yes.

648. Do you know any British university in which it is given in pedagogy alone?—No; I know it is in German universities.

649. Would not a certificate meet all the purposes without giving a special degree?—No, I think not.

650. You do not know of a university in which such a special degree is given?—No.

CHRISTCHURCH.

FRIDAY, 10TH MAY, 1901.

H. C. LANE, Secretary of the North Canterbury Education Board, examined.

Mr. Lane: I am not prepared with any statement with regard to the proposed scheme, but if any questions are put to me I am prepared to answer them.

1. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your experience with regard to educational affairs in New Zealand?—I have been with this Board for nearly nine years.

2. In what position?—For the first three years as assistant secretary, and since 1895 as secretary to the Board.

3. Have you had any experience as a teacher?—No.

4. Has your Board, like most of the Boards in the colony, suffered recently from financial embarrassment?—To some extent.

5. Do you think that the introduction of a colonial scale of salary would relieve this financial pressure?—It would altogether depend upon the working of it. If a colonial scale were drawn up that left Education Boards with sufficient for their other expenditure, and was in itself a workable scale, then I think it would be a good thing.

6. Do you know the Canterbury Education District very well?—Pretty well.

7. Have you ever considered the question of conveying children to a central school rather than establishing a large number of small schools?—That matter has been before the Board on one or two occasions, but difficulties were found, and the Board gave up the idea of introducing it.

8. Do you think, with the good roads and railway communication, that any of the small schools might be closed and the children attending those small schools conveyed to central and larger schools?—I do not think it would work out in practice, and there would be great opposition to it from the residents in the localities where the schools were proposed to be closed.

9. You think pressure would be brought to bear by members of School Committees on members of the Education Boards to prevent the carrying-out of such a scheme?—Not from the School Committees, because I take it that there would be no School Committees in the places where the schools were proposed to be closed, but the residents would object.

10. Are you aware that in Victoria at the present time the settlers in sparsely populated districts are applying to have their children taken to the larger centres rather than have these small schools established?—No, I was not aware of that.

11. What amount of subsidy do your Board receive for the inspection of schools?—£500 per year.

12. What is the total cost of the inspection expenses?—Last year the cost was £1,635 1s. 3d.

13. Does that include travelling-expenses?—That is the total cost of school inspection.

14. What is the amount actually to be provided for by your Board for inspection purposes?—It would be the difference—£1,135 1s. 3d.

15. If the control of the Inspectors was taken over by the department, and the payment of the Inspectors also, that would relieve your Board to the extent of something like £1,100?—It would, of course, relieve the Board to that extent. That is simply looking at it from a financial point of view.

16. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do I understand you to say that you have schools where there are no Committees?—In the localities where there are aided schools there is no properly constituted School Committee. There is a committee of residents for the purpose of looking after the school, but there is no district School Committee.

17. Is that in compliance with the Act?—Unless there is a district school the Act does not provide for a Committee.

18. What is the average attendance at those aided schools?—At the end of the year there were eleven aided schools with under 15 pupils, four with under 20, two under 25, and one just over 25.

19. Are the teachers of those aided schools certificated teachers?—In most cases they are; in some few they are partially certificated, and in a very few they are not certificated.

20. Do you ever appoint members of the household to teach such schools?—Never.

21. *Mr. Luke.*] Have you any other small schools besides those that are aided?—At the end of the school-year we had twelve district schools which, owing to the decrease in attendance, had fallen below 15. That is in addition to the aided schools.

22. Has the North Canterbury Education Board ever tried the half-time schools?—The Board has one such school at the Bealey. That is the only district from which such an application has been made, and it is working very well.

23. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] From your experience you would favour the adoption of a colonial scale of staffing schools and of paying salaries?—With some reservation, I would.

24. How far do you consider the proposed scale of staffing schools will affect the teachers in the North Canterbury District?—The effect will vary a good deal. It will benefit some of the teachers, but others it will affect adversely.

25. And, in the event of its adoption, would you suggest that the salaries be decreased when the proposed scale came into operation, or not until fresh appointments were made?—Well, so far as this district is concerned, this scale would come into operation at once. Very few alterations would be necessary.

26. How many pupils do you consider a sole teacher is capable of instructing—a male in the first place, and a female in the second place?—I think a master in sole charge of a school can manage fairly well up to an average of 41. Of course, a good deal depends on the circumstances. If the average attendance of 41 is drawn from a large number—the attendance being very irregular—the master would have many more difficulties to contend with than he would have if the average was from children attending very regularly.

27. Could you give us an idea of the number of schools in the North Canterbury District with an average attendance of less than 50?—Yes; 133 schools.

28. What is the total number of your schools altogether?—There were 202 at the end of last year.

29. More than half of them have an average attendance of less than 50?—Yes.

30. How many pupils, then, can a sole mistress efficiently teach?—I think a mistress would have considerably more difficulty as the school became larger. The number of boys would, of course, be larger as the school approached 41, and she would not on that account be able to conduct the school quite so efficiently as a master. I may say that this Board, after a certain point, does not engage mistresses for sole charge. Up to 20 pupils a mistress is appointed; between 20 and 30 it depends a good deal upon circumstances; over 30 a master is always appointed.

31. Your Board considers that up to 30 pupils a female is just as efficient as a male, except under exceptional circumstances?—Yes.

32. Do you give her the same salary?—In this district the salaries are equal.

33. I notice that in the proposed scale of salaries a teacher with an average attendance of 40 gets £150 a year, whereas if the average attendance is 41 he gets £140 a year?—Yes.

34. It would pay the teacher if the forty-first pupil did not put in an appearance?—Not altogether. Financially, it would; but as regards work he would have double by keeping it all to himself.

35. Are there too many pupil-teachers in the employment of the North Canterbury Education Board?—Not at the present time.

36. You have a preponderance of females in both pupil and assistant teachers?—The number of female teachers is larger than the number of male teachers.

37. Do you meet any considerable difficulty in getting male pupil-teachers?—There is some difficulty, but I do not think it is insurmountable.

38. That is to say, there will be a sufficient number of male teachers forthcoming to fill the positions that will be more efficiently filled by male teachers?—Yes, provided the regulations are framed to meet the difficulty.

39. Is it not a fact that your Board gives a preference to female pupil and assistant teachers?—No, the Board does not give a preference to female pupil-teachers. It gives the preference to mistresses for small schools, because up to 20 pupils a school is better with a mistress.

40. How do you account for the great preponderance of female pupils attending the training-college here?—That is a good deal owing to the recommendations of the various School Committees. They almost invariably recommend female pupil-teachers.

41. Do you consider it advisable to adopt a system of retiring-allowances or giving superannuation to teachers who have grown old in the service?—I do not think so.

42. You consider they can lay enough by from the salaries they get to maintain them after they are too old to follow their occupation?—I have not considered that question; but, on the face of it, I do not see why a teacher is entitled to a pension more than a person in any other calling.

43. Do you consider that Inspectors should be under a central Board in order to secure uniformity of examination?—I think the centralisation of Inspectors would lead to many difficulties.

44. Would the benefits not outweigh those difficulties?—A good deal would, of course, depend upon the instructions received from the department by the Inspectors as to their duties. If the Inspectors were to continue doing what they are doing now, things would go on very much the same; but if the duties were considerably altered, and they became servants of the department, responsible to the department rather than to the Boards, I think there would be difficulties.

45. Your Board receives a good round sum annually from the reserves—something like £12,000?—The Board derives no revenue from the reserves. It is paid by the Commissioners to the Board, say, one quarter, and the next quarter it is deducted by the department from the capitation allowance.

46 You are getting an allowance for district high schools?—The Board has no district high schools. The Board is proposing to start a district high school at Akaroa.

47. You have district high schools at Rangiora and Kaiapoi?—No; they are established by statute, and the Board has nothing to do with them.

48. *Mr. Smith.*] I think you said there were twenty schools with under 15 pupils?—There are twenty-three under 15, including aided schools.

49. Do you know the lowest number attending any one school?—I think the lowest would be at the half-time school at Bealey, which has an attendance of 6. There are two, I see, of 7, and one of 8.

50. Could your Board grant assistance to any smaller number if it was asked for?—The practice of the Board has been to grant assistance where there are two or three families—not for one family.

51. If a settler lives in a particularly out-of-the-way part of the country, and has five children, you would not grant him any assistance at all?—No; the Board consider that if there is one family only the State should not provide for instructing those children.

52. He would be deprived from all benefit of the Education Act?—Yes.

53. *Mr. Hill.*] What number of schools are there in your district with an average attendance of between 21 and 25?—There are twenty-two schools of 20 and under 25.

54. Could you tell us the average attendance of those schools?—Not at the moment. They would have to be picked out of the list.

55. Perhaps you could supply me with that later on?—Yes.

56. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Have you a house for your teachers at all the schools?—Not for all of them.

57. Do you give house allowance to the teachers where there are no houses?—Yes.

58. What is your annual grant for building?—Approximately, between £5,500 and £6,000.

59. Have you ever considered giving house allowance out of that grant instead of out of capitation?—No. I fancy that some years ago the Board were in communication with the department on the subject, and the department would not allow any of the building grant to be used for that purpose.

60. I suppose you pay all the teachers?—Until recently all the teachers were paid through the Committees, but at the present time about one-third of them are paid direct.

61. *Mr. Hogben.*] Can you furnish the Commission with the Board's expenses for the three years 1898, 1899, and 1900?—Yes. All the returns are based on the working-average.

62. I see you have in Canterbury twenty-two schools with an average attendance of under 15—of that eleven are aided schools?—There are twenty-three altogether. Twelve are not aided and eleven are aided schools.

63. Which quarter was that?—At the end of 1900.

64. There are twelve district schools having under 15 pupils?—Yes.

65. Have you gone into the question of the amount that is available for the Board's expenses after the payment of teachers?—Yes, I may say I have.

66. What do you make that to be for the year 1900? What was available after deducting what was required for teachers' salaries and allowances last year?—The cost per head of teachers' salaries and allowances last year was £3 2s. 4¼d., and the capitation was £3 15s.

67. Did that include the payment for the instruction of pupil-teachers?—Yes.

68. And house allowances?—Yes.

69. Then, the balance is available for the general expenses of the Board?—The balance remaining was insufficient for the expenses of the Board.

70. How much did the Board go to the bad last year?—They finished up with a liability of £2,000, or a little over.

71. Was that all acquired last year?—No.

72. How much was?—The new scale came into operation about April, I think.

73. Does the other expenditure include the cost of the Normal School?—Yes.

74. The salaries of the teachers, or were they included in the general salaries?—The salaries of Normal School teachers are included in the return of the teachers' salaries.

75. Just the salaries of the Normal School?—Not the training department.

76. That is in the general expenses of the Board?—Yes.

77. Did the Board pay for any technical instruction or kindergarten work?—It paid for manual and technical instruction £142 4s. 4d., and the receipts were £119 8s. 6d.

78. Are you in a position to answer this question: Would the other expenditure of the Board amount to as much as £9,632 with the manual and technical instruction and the cost of the Normal School deducted?—Yes, it would amount to more than that.

79. Have you included scholarships in that?—No.

80. Nor building expenses at all?—No.

81. Can you give me the figures?—Yes. Putting on one side the teachers' salaries and the training department of the Normal School, the balance would be £11,168.

82. What was the amount of capitation paid to the Board last year?—£50,171. Then, to that has to be added the payments of the School Commissioners, £12,835.

83. Teachers' salaries amounted to how much?—£52,320 2s. 11d.

84. Have you deducted the cost to the Board of manual and technical instruction?—The cost of that to the Board was not £100.

85. Then, roughly speaking, about £10,500 was available for the general expenses of the Board, and they came to over £11,000?—Yes. The training grant of £500 would, of course, have to be deducted from the £1,847, leaving the net cost of the training department at £1,347.

86. And the rest of the details you will be able to show us in a return?—I have here a statement of the receipts and expenditure based on the allowances under the proposed colonial scale, and on the actual expenditure for 1900. [Exhibit 27.]

87. *Mr. Weston.*] With respect to the incidental expenses in this statement, the figures represent £6,699 12s. 1d: has that amount been found sufficient for North Canterbury?—Generally speaking, yes. I think there is some doubt with regard to the three large schools.

88. Have we complaints throughout the district of insufficient contingency money?—Yes, a number of complaints have been received. The Board have two rather serious ones under consideration now.

89. Where?—Christchurch East and Oxford East.

90. What would be, in your opinion, the effect of a reduction in the incidental grant?—It would depend, of course, on the amount taken away.

91. Supposing there was an appreciable amount taken off the incidental allowances, what would happen?—I think most of the Committees would find themselves in great difficulties to meet expenses.

92. I believe it is true that our incidental allowances are considerably greater than those given in Otago?—Yes.

93. But, notwithstanding that, do you see your way to a reduction of the incidental allowance to these various schools?—I do not think so. The Board took 5 per cent. off fifteen months ago, and several Committees wrote saying it was impossible for them to continue to meet the expenses of the schools, and at the Board's next meeting a deputation will come to ask the Board to go through the Committee's accounts and check off the expenditure, to ascertain whether their contention is not correct.

94. Your account shows the deficiency of the Board to be £2,604 9s. 4d.: how is that, in your opinion, to be met?—Supposing the Board received the amount proposed by the department?

95. Yes?—I do not know how it could be met.

96. You have read the scale of staffing?—Yes.

97. How will that work, generally speaking, in North Canterbury?—As I said before, some of the teachers will benefit, others will not. Generally speaking, the Board's scale would soon work into this. But a large number of the payments are faulty in this scale.

98. What is your opinion as to the several sums placed against the various items of attendance—salaries?—I do not think that the basis of the adjustment of salaries is altogether sound in this scale.

99. In what way is it not sound?—You will notice that a mistress in a school of 35 receives £80, and that she receives no increase at all until the school reaches an average of 75. Then, again, the salary mentioned here for a mistress in the country is £80, and that amount is also given for junior assistants in the towns. I think if that sum is sufficient for the former it is too much for the junior positions in the towns.

100. What do you say with regard to the proposed salaries of the infant mistresses, headmistresses, first and second assistants?—What strikes me with regard to the second group, dealing with assistants, is that the salary of the first assistant master is very much in excess of the salary of the second assistant master.

101. What do you suggest?—It is just a matter of money. One is undoubtedly too low, but I would not like to say that the first is too high. I think they should be equalised a little more nearly.

102. What do you think with regard to the relative salaries of the third and fourth female assistants?—That would be the same position.

103. Are they fair relatively?—No, not quite so, I think. I fancy that a third assistant mistress, after starting in a school at 175, should get some increase before an average of 390, as shown here. She would work at £80 a year all the time, and would never get an increase at all.

104. Have you considered the position of infant mistresses and headmistresses under this scale?—Under this scale the salaries are equal.

105. Is the principle for one or the other an unsound one?—The Board has always taken it that there should be some difference in the salaries. There are only four large schools in that group. In the Board's opinion the one should be larger than the other.

106. In this proposed scale has overstaffing been considered, do you think?—Of course, I do not know whether the framers of the scale have considered the question.

107. Does overstaffing involve a considerable item in North Canterbury?—Under this scale overstaffing would be very large indeed.

108. Why?—The introduction of a mistress at 35 at £80 would, under this scale, lead to a large amount of overstaffing. Committees would manage to get the attendance up to 36 and apply for the mistress, and then the average might go down, and you could not get her out under nine or ten months. Then there is the introduction of a pupil-teacher at 75. A pupil-teacher cannot very well be removed after having been once appointed, and the average might go down to 65, and there would be overstaffing there. Then there would be overstaffing in the case of the appointment of the next assistant mistress at 100. It is in the small schools that overstaffing mounts up. In the very large schools the proportion is quite different.

109. What does the present overstaffing and relieving cost the Board?—Well, the Board has for some time past been very careful in the matter of staffing, and has kept it down very strictly. At the present time there is not much overstaffing for more than two quarters. I think the overstaffing and the relieving usually run to £500 or £600 per annum. Under this scale it would more nearly approach £1,000.

110. The proposed scale, if carried, would necessitate the introduction of 458 teachers?—I think so.

111. Where are they to come from? Have we many disengaged teachers in Canterbury?—Not in that proportion, I think. Of course, at this time of the year the students from the Normal School would increase the number; but I think forty male and female teachers, including the ex-students, would be about the number.

112. Do you think that 458 teachers could be readily found in the colony to fill these vacancies?—I think, if they could be found, the want of employment in other centres must be very much worse than it is in North Canterbury.

113. The introduction of the colonial scale would, I apprehend, entail a good deal of work in the preparation of quarterly returns, and so forth?—There would be quarterly returns of the staffs to the department.

114. What do you say to that?—I have nothing to say to that.

115. It would naturally increase the departmental expenses in the office?—Yes. The departmental expenses on this statement are lower than they will probably be next year.

116. Do you approve of the reduction of £10 from the teacher's salary in order to pay the sewing-mistress?—No, I do not think it is sound in principle.

117. What are your views in regard to the amount of house allowance to teachers who have not residences?—This scale deals with that point, but with no finality. It is left in abeyance.

118. What do you think would be a fair amount for rent allowance to teachers?—Under the Board's regulations it depends upon the size of the school. The teacher of a very small country school gets £12.

119. That is regarded to be enough?—Evidently so.

120. Speaking generally upon this scale in regard to incidental allowances, what effect will it have on the position in North Canterbury if the incidental allowances are not increased?—Under the proposed scale there will be a deficiency of over £2,000. If that were left so, I fancy a great number of the Committees would refuse to take office in this district, because the Board would have to make such a great reduction in the incidental allowances.

121. There has already been considerable trouble in some districts in that way?—Yes.

122. What is your opinion in regard to the suggestions as to pupil-teachers in this scale?—The number of pupil-teachers under the proposed scale is very much the same as the present number. If anything, it is slightly increased.

123. What is your opinion in regard to the payment of pupil-teachers, more especially in the fifth year?—I think the provision for making a reduction from the fourth year's salary to that of the third year, if the pupil-teacher is kept on for another year, is unsound.

124. Why?—A pupil-teacher after four years' service would naturally object to receive third-year pay if asked to continue in that school.

125. Is the payment to pupil-teachers, in your opinion, sufficient?—I think it should be increased.

126. To what extent?—If the funds are available, I think the department's proposals under that head are very good.

127. If the pupil-teachers' pay is increased, should the pay of the training students be increased?—Yes, it would naturally mean an increase in that direction. For this year it would mean an additional expenditure of £410.

128. *Mr. Hill.*] I see you receive £300 for the training of teachers?—This year we receive £500.

129. It costs you £1,847 15s. 10d., so that you lost last year over £1,300?—Yes.

130. And it cost you £1,635 for inspection and travelling-allowances, and you received £500, making another loss of £1,135?—Yes.

131. So that on these two items you lost about £2,400?—Yes.

132. *Mr. Hogben.*] I am not quite clear in regard to the general expenses of your Board. In the allowances to School Committees under the head of incidental expenses there are included repairs: out of what fund is this expenditure on repairs met?—Out of the Maintenance Account, as far as they are done by Committees.

133. They are repairs to buildings and furniture and premises?—Small repairs.

134. But they are repairs?—Yes.

135. In the return I asked for just now I want these excluded?—I am afraid it would be almost impracticable. It would be necessary to go through all the Committees' balance-sheets, and even then I think the figures could not be got, for they lump the items very much. I do not think many of the Committees spend much on small repairs, for the Board have great difficulty with them, and in the long-run the Board have to find the money substantially for repairs.

136. The Committees do not carry out the regulations?—The Board has great difficulty in getting them to carry that one out, and has to come to their assistance out of the Building Account.

137. You do not think the amount actually expended on these items is very much?—I should have to go through all the balance-sheets to give you a reliable estimate; but, seeing that there are 170 Committees, I should say that probably quite £500 of that incidental grant goes on repairs.

138. Do you think that those could be legally taken out of the building grant?—I am not quite sure. Some years ago the Board were in correspondence with the department over this matter, and the department ruled that the building grant must be used for building.

139. And repairs?—I do not think I am wrong in saying that the matter of repairs was objected to by the department some years ago. I think it was first of all objected to, but I am not sure on that point.

140. In regard to the evil of overstaffing, would not the payment of salaries on the average attendance for a longer period than one quarter—say, for a year—obviate the evil?—No, the danger would still be there.

141. You spoke of the effort of the Committee to bring up the attendance for one quarter; but if the staffing was based on a long period, do you not think it would reduce the evil of overstaffing?—This Board has always made it a rule to wait for two consecutive quarters before granting an extra teacher, but still the overstaffing remains.

142. It would be more difficult to get up the average for four quarters?—Yes.

143. And you could guard against extreme cases of sudden rise and fall by the transference of teachers?—Under the present system it would be very difficult indeed to introduce any system of transferring teachers.

144. You are aware that the Act gives power to do that?—It is unworkable; that was the conclusion the Board came to.

145. Have the Committee to approve of the parties?—No; but the Committee have to be consulted, and if after consultation the Board were simply to appoint its own teacher it would not be a *bond fide* consultation. In practice, the Committees in this district have a good deal to do with the appointment of teachers.

146. Do you think that that difficulty would exist to such an extent with a regulation dealing with the transfer of teachers under a colonial scale of staffing and salaries?—I think there would be a good deal of objection to it by the Committees.

147. Do you not think that if it was general all over the colony the objection would disappear?—No; teachers have to live with the residents, and Committees would, I think, object to have teachers foisted upon them. In most cases a teacher so appointed might have an unpleasant time of it.

148. On what ground do you say that the grant of £10 to the sewing-mistress is unsound?—Well, if the master is not superintending the sewing he is giving some other instruction, and I do not think he should have £10 deducted.

149. If he is a married man, to whom would the £10 be generally paid under the proposed scale?—Well, apparently to the wife; but possibly the wife may not be competent to act as instructress in sewing.

150. A married man's expenses are more than an unmarried man's?—Yes.

151. An unmarried man with £10 less would be better off than a married teacher?—It would depend on circumstances.

152. Generally speaking?—The unmarried man would be the better off.

153. *The Chairman.*] It would depend very much upon the habits of the man?—Yes.

154. Some of your teachers are paid direct from the Board and others are paid through the Committees?—Yes.

155. Why is that done?—It was done after the Board received a request from the Teachers' Institute that direct payment should be adopted. The Board felt that the practice of payment through the Committees had been in existence so long that the opinion of the Committees should be taken on the matter. When the replies came in it was found that about half did not care, and about half protested against it—some in very strong terms. The Board accordingly decided to pay the teachers direct where the Committees were agreeable, but where the Committees were not agreeable they continued the old plan.

156. Do you not think it would be much better if you paid all the teachers direct?—I am inclined to think it would be. It would involve, of course, a little extra work.

157. Are you aware of your system of payment of teachers through Committees being adopted in any other district?—I have not much knowledge of the system in other districts, but I know that in Otago they pay direct.

158. Have you made any inquiries as to the extra labour that would be involved?—The Board has made no inquiry, but, as a member of the office staff, I know that a large amount of office-work would be involved.

159. Do you not think it desirable that the payment of teachers should be uniform?—I think it would be rather a good thing for teachers to be paid direct.

160. I understand you have caretakers in this district?—Yes.

161. Are many of them provided with residences?—Only in cases where the schools are very large.

162. Merely in and around Christchurch?—Not altogether. In one or two schools in the country where buildings have been at the disposal of the Board.

163. Have you custodians in the country without residences?—There the caretakers are engaged by the respective Committees.

164. What are the salaries that are paid to these caretakers?—The Board does not pay them, but I think they commence at about £8 a year.

165. What is paid in the case of the city schools?—In the largest city schools the caretakers get, I think, £80 or £90 a year, with a residence.

166. What is the rental value of these residences?—Probably about 7s. 6d. per week.

167. I suppose here, as in other districts, you find that the schools show a falling-off?—Yes, very much; and it is continuing too, unfortunately.

168. When that occurs are teachers' salaries reduced?—No general reduction in salaries takes place unless a new scale is brought into operation.

169. Supposing the attendance of a school falls off 50, would the salary of the teacher suffer?—The scale would operate, and the teacher would be retired after consultation with the Committee. The Board waits for two quarters before any action is taken, and the Committee is then consulted—that takes about a month—and then three months' notice has to be given. It takes ten months before a teacher can be removed.

170. Instead of reducing the teacher's salary in accordance with the regulations, you would retire the teacher altogether?—The Board removes the teacher from the school, but very soon finds him another position.

171. Has he not the option of accepting a lower salary?—There is no option if the attendance falls below the minimum for two quarters—the teacher is removed.

172. He is virtually dismissed?—I do not like the word "dismissal." He is removed.

173. What happens to a teacher when the falling-off is gradual?—He is paid a smaller amount by the scale.

174. His salary is reduced?—Yes.

175. Have you made reductions in many cases lately?—The scale is always in force, and reductions are constantly going on.

176. Has the Board been frequently in conflict with Committees in regard to the selection of teachers?—During the last few years the Board has had very little trouble indeed.

177. When vacancies arise do you invariably invite applications?—Always, except in the case of aided schools. Occasionally a teacher is promoted in the larger schools, but it has to be done in due form.

178. I notice, compared with some other districts, your incidental expenses are somewhat large?—The incidental expenses are larger in this district.

179. For instance, compared with the schools of Wellington, in many cases they are nearly double here?—That is so; there is a great difference.

180. Can you account for that?—I do not know the conditions surrounding the Wellington schools. I think that in North Canterbury perhaps firing costs a good deal of money. In Otago fuel would be much cheaper, and probably the stone schools would not require so much attention; but the fact remains that fifteen months ago the Board attempted to make a 5-per-cent. reduction, and the outcry of the Committees was very persistent, and there is a deputation coming to the Board at the next meeting to see what can be done.

181. When vacancies occur have you any great difficulty in finding suitable teachers?—No difficulty at all, except occasionally in the outlying districts, where the conditions of living are not very conducive to comfort.

182. Do you find that many of your most qualified teachers are leaving the profession?—No; we have not lost many.

183. Do the assistants complain of their salaries as compared with those of the headmasters?—I think, generally speaking, complaints have been received from all sections of the teaching profession.

184. I suppose all the headmasters receive either a free house or rent allowance?—Yes.

185. Is that extended to the assistant as well, assuming he is a married man?—No.

186. Then, although the headmasters receive nearly double the salary, the assistants are not allowed house allowance?—No.

187. *Mr. Stewart.*] Does it obtain in your district that the wives of members of the School Committees are sewing-mistresses in the schools?—In a good many cases the sewing-mistress is the relative of the Chairman or of a member of the Committee.

188. Do you think it is more justifiable to do that, or to appoint the wife of the teacher?—I think it depends on the circumstances of each case. Generally speaking, the master's wife is as qualified to teach sewing as the relative of a member of the Committee.

189. On whose recommendation are these appointments made?—The sewing-mistress is appointed by the Committee, subject to the approval of the Board. This Board always agrees to the appointment if the candidate is suited for the position.

190. The suitability of the candidate is judged by the Committee?—Yes.

191. Do you not think it would be wise to make it a statutory disability that a relative of a member of the School Committee should be appointed?—I think it would debar suitable candidates in many cases. I think the Committeemen's families are the only ones you could draw a sewing-mistress from in some cases. Of course, there is the master's wife; but in some cases there is no master's wife at all.

192. I think, under this proposed scale, where there is a mistress, the next appointment must be a master?—Yes.

193. How do you think that would work?—I do not think it would work at all.

L. B. Wood, Inspector of Schools, examined.

Mr. Wood: I may say at the outset that I am in favour of a colonial scale. You have all doubtless had a multiplicity of examples put before you as to how such a scale would benefit the small districts, but I wish to show you how I think the large districts may reasonably be expected to benefit by it also. In Otago, where I worked for some years as a teacher, they had the most barbarous system at work that I could conceive of in a country liberally provided with funds for the maintenance of education. I refer to the staffing of schools single-handed. I do not wish to make any reflection upon Otago as an educational district, for, notwithstanding this barbarous system, it is perhaps the best educational district in New Zealand. You will scarcely credit me when I say that in a school with an average attendance of 50, and sometimes as many as 65 on the roll, a teacher had to slave away single-handed with eight classes and teaching about thirteen subjects. I say, in the light of comparison with this colonial scale, what is there to say about what they had to submit to in Otago for years? The evil is now modified slightly, but not nearly enough yet. Under a colonial scale such a system could never have existed. It could never have stood the criticism of the colony. Again, with regard to incidental allowances to Committees, I will give you an instance of how a "large" Board can blunder. In the year 1894 a scale was introduced in this district by which the teachers suffered a very large reduction. I offered a remonstrance at the time against the teachers suffering any reduction whatever—it should have come out of the incidental expenses. There were thirty more schools in Otago than there were in North Canterbury, and yet the incidental expenses to the Committees of Otago were about £1,750 less than they were here in Canterbury. What can you say about that? Immediately that is submitted to colonial criticism as apart from parish criticism the thing will not hold water. There must be something like a uniform scale of incidentals throughout the colony, and a general reduction throughout North Canterbury. One other illustration of the benefit to be derived by a large district from a colonial scale I may be permitted to give, as it has an important bearing on a question which must deeply concern this Commission—the question of equal pay to men and women. An important principle in our scale of 1894 showed that the Board were inclined to favour equal pay to men and women, and in carrying out this principle a large measure of injustice was

inflicted on our men, from which they have suffered up to the present day, not only financially, but in bitterness of feeling that has been fermenting throughout the district, and becoming acute up to the last few months. That ought not to have taken place, because, considering the social and economic conditions under which we live, I do not think that the question admits of any argument. You must pay a man considerably more than a woman. A man is justified in having a much larger wage, for when a man enters the profession he is there for life. In the case of women, nine out of every ten expect to be out of the profession before five years are over their heads. I have heard you ask the question this morning why men should wish to leave the profession. My experience is that teachers are hopeless failures outside their profession, except the exceptional genius who would be a success in anything he turned his attention seriously to. Turning now to the consideration of the details of the proposed scale, I am of opinion that, although there are a good many defects in it—defects that you might call crudities—the scale before you has one point of such supreme importance that if it had no other merit I would support it against our own. The first defect that I see is one that shows a want of continuity in the development of the scale. The scale begins with a master and then introduces the first increment, a mistress. That I approve of—a mistress rather than a pupil-teacher. That is at 35. A question arises whether it should be at 35 or a little further on. In North Canterbury we meet the difficulty between 35 and 41 by putting on a sort of monitorial labour. God forbid that teachers should ever be prepared in that way for the profession. It is there that our system and every system in the colony has been steadily at fault for many years —the preparing of the people that are to succeed us in the profession. I am in favour of introducing the mistress at 41, because by this means a very great saving will be effected that might very well be applied in other directions. Under the modification I suggest, £12 would be paid to the monitor giving the required assistance between 35 and 41; and we would increase the master's salary very substantially, to mark the difficulties he has to encounter at that stage. Instead of a £2 increment he would go rapidly up: £2 10s. at 36, £3 at 37, £3 10s. at 38, £4 at 40. Such a teacher is doing the hardest work in the profession, bar none. Here the question of the certificate required comes in; but putting that aside just now, and going on with the scale, we find at 76 it is proposed to introduce the first pupil-teacher. My idea is that we might defer that to 81. There is one thing in this scale that is proposed that I certainly would not approve—that is, the paying of a master at 36, when he has got a mistress, the same salary that he got when he was at 35. You must pay a man, in a measure, according to the work he does. There is no rosy billet in the teaching profession so far as I know, but if there is a rosy billet it is that of the master of a school running from 36 to 50 where a mistress is provided. Going on with the scale, then: A mistress is introduced at 100. I think it would be preferable to introduce a pupil-teacher instead at 110. After that the scale might readily be made to develop on right lines. At 600, however, a serious dislocation, amounting to a compound fracture, occurs, and the serious nature of the defect caused by the want of continuity at this stage will be at once apparent if you have a school staffed according to the scale at 601, and then when the attendance falls below this point—to, say, 600—try to make the reductions in staff and salaries required by the scale. The Inspector-General has explained how the dislocation of the staffing can be remedied. He had made a sudden break, and departed from the principle that determined the previous staffing of the schools. It is a very important point, because in two or three districts there are a goodly number of schools, in Auckland and Otago especially, where this would apply. It does not affect us here in North Canterbury in the least. Any other criticisms that I may have to offer, more especially as regards the financial details of the scale, will probably be brought out in questions from the members of the Commission. I have thus far only dealt with the numerical strength of the staff. There is just one other point, but it is of the very greatest importance, and one on which I shall support this scale notwithstanding its defects, for they can be easily adjusted, and that is this—probably the Inspector-General had it in his mind's eye: that the staffing is so liberal, so splendidly liberal, up to that point of 600, when there will probably be a readjustment, that I am certain if the proposed scale came into operation in this district we should immediately proceed to reduce the work of our pupil-teachers in school by one-half. I consider that we have here an opportunity to effect the most splendid reform that has ever taken place since the Education Act was passed, and on that point alone would I support the scale, with, as I said, all its defects. Two years ago I happened to go home to the Old Country after an absence of eighteen or nineteen years, and of all the reforms that had been instituted in my absence the best was that relating to pupil-teachers. Under the most enlightened School Boards—Boards like that of Glasgow—whose administration is universally commended, the condition of the pupil-teachers has been vastly improved of recent years. Instead of being compelled, as they formerly were, to slave all day teaching in school, with very limited opportunities for improving their scholarship, these young people are now restricted in their actual teaching to half, or at most two-thirds, of the day, the remainder of the school time being devoted to study. Now, under the liberal provision of staff proposed in this colonial scale, New Zealand should have no difficulty whatever in following the noble example of the Old Country in carrying out this very necessary reform in the training of our young teachers. How readily the means of reform would be available here in North Canterbury you can understand at once by casting a glance at the organization of the most important group of schools we have—viz., those whose attendance ranges from 420 to 480, including Richmond, St. Albans, Waltham, Addington, Woolston, Lyttelton, and Kaiapoi. For each of these schools the scale of staff at present in operation with us provides six certificated teachers and four pupil-teachers. Under the colonial scale there would be seven adults and five pupil-teachers —an addition of one assistant and one pupil-teacher; and this strengthening of the staff would make it an easy matter to effect a great deduction in the time that the pupil-teachers would be

required to engage in the actual work of teaching. In concluding my remarks, I have, however, to point out that our four city schools would receive no benefit at all from the introduction of the colonial scale. They occupy a unique position among New Zealand schools, and would require to be treated with special consideration under any colonial scheme. Regarding the financial aspect of the scale, I am disposed to think that I had better postpone the expression of my opinions on the various salaries proposed until I am questioned on these matters by members of the Commission.

194. *Mr. Weston.*] You have read this colonial scale?—Yes, I have gone through it.

195. Have you sufficiently studied it to satisfy yourself that the allowance to teachers, together with all the charges that will be attached to the capitation, can be effected on a capitation of £4?—I think so. Everything in this scale can be carried out with the £4 capitation.

196. But would that scale be exceeded, so far as North Canterbury is concerned, in the amount of incidentals?—I am not prepared to say, but I should think it would, because I have always maintained that North Canterbury was far too liberal in the matter of incidental expenses. Compared with other districts, our practice is positively absurd, and the teachers are now suffering reductions which they should never have been called upon to suffer.

197. You, of course, visit the various country districts regularly: are you able to tell us, so far as you can see, if there has been any waste in regard to the incidentals by the various Committees?—I could not say, because I have not an opportunity of overlooking the Committees' accounts.

198. Have you seen any signs of extravagance?—No; occasionally signs of neglect.

199. How would a colonial scale work with regard to the smaller schools?—Aided schools below 14 are receiving a capitation of £5. I have always believed there must be some limit with regard to the Government grants for maintaining these small schools. I think the plan adopted in this district is in the main a sound one. For some years it has been the usual practice to grant this capitation allowance of £5 to a small school, which might be composed of three or four families, with an attendance of 10, or, under exceptional circumstances, even less. I think we have fifteen coming under the aided conditions. There are eleven aided schools under 15. Well, the system here is, we make the allowance on the condition that the settlers in the district will, by contributions of their own, make up the salary of the teacher to what you might call a living-wage. I am doubtful how far the Board is right in accepting maintenance in the household of one of the families as an equivalent for salary. My own opinion is that it must be paid to the teacher in hard cash, or else there is a violation of the Truck Act.

200. At Nelson, I am told that even one child in a house is subsidised, and that the capitation may be paid even to the mother or daughter to teach in that house: what do you think of that?—If that were made a colonial scheme, and carried out throughout the colony, you would simply swamp the education system of New Zealand.

201. Speaking of the colony generally, what, in your opinion, should be the minimum number of children subsidised?—That is a harder question to answer. I have said in our district we have eleven aided schools; sometimes the average attendance is 8; in one case it is as low as 7. If you could expect that reasonable care would be taken in making the grant, as we have done, I think benefits might occasionally be conferred on very small groups. I should say, however, that the number in attendance entitling to a grant under a fixed rule should not be below 10.

202. I presume that would cut out a large number of children who are scattered, we will say, through the Nelson District and the Sounds?—I am sorry that should be. Still, there must be compensation somewhere. The settlers in those districts, for instance, get land very much cheaper than we can in Canterbury.

203. Returning to the scale, do you think that the relative positions of the infant mistress, headmistress, and the first assistant master or mistress, as the case may be, are sufficiently equitable?—Which groups are you referring to?

204. More especially from 250 to 600. In North Canterbury there has been a very strong feeling on the part of the headmistress in regard to her position as compared with the infant mistress, and the financial position of the first assistant masters and mistresses: do you think that all those points have been sufficiently considered by the draftsman of the suggested scale, and whether the prospects of their relative positions are equitable?—That includes some of the minor defects in the scheme. The introduction of the lowest mistress at £80 is an improvement on our scale. I think the Inspector-General calls that a working-wage, and I think he is right. In the big city schools the lowest class of mistress gets the same salary as the mistress going to the country. We find, if we invite applications for a position of mistress in the country at a salary of £80, we will get a comparatively small number of applicants, a few of them well qualified—a very few. If we invite applications for the lowest position, carrying the same salary, in the city schools, we would be swamped with applications, and quite a number of them have the very highest qualifications; so that in the lower class of appointments we can staff these schools much cheaper. In the city schools we have no difficulty in getting young assistants at a comparatively low salary, because they are continuing their education at college, and reaping other advantages. Unfortunately, in this district the Board exercises little or no control over these appointments in the city schools.

205. Will this scale as prepared either encourage or hinder applications by assistant masters in our town schools for higher positions in our country schools, seeing, as you have just said, as one knows from experience, that there is a disinclination on the part of the assistant masters and mistresses to go from town?—It would hinder at the stages following on the first introduction of a mistress in the country. We in North Canterbury pay a mistress in this class of school between £75 and £100, against a fixed salary of £80 in the proposed scale. The salary ought to go up a little there. A readjustment of salaries in the scale might readily be made to meet the difficulty.

206. Taking the infant mistress and the headmistress, which do you regard as the highest official?—The head mistress. Here I think the scale is distinctly wrong: it puts them both on the same level. We have for years assumed in this district that the relative values, financially, of their services are as three is to four—£150 to £200.

207. Will you state your reasons why there should be more salary paid to the headmistress?—The difference is as to responsibility. The duties of that mistress are distinctly more important. It is much more difficult for us to get a mistress to discharge those duties well. She is responsible practically for the well-being of all the girls in her department—*i.e.*, for all girls in Standards II. to VII. She has to supervise the sewing, hold examinations, and correct hundreds of examination-papers and other written exercises outside of school-hours, and has to be a teacher of high scholastic attainments. Both these mistresses occupy extremely important positions, but there is a distinct difference in their qualifications and in the arduous nature of the duties imposed on them.

208. Therefore, in regard to salary, you think there should be a difference?—Yes; I should say, about £40 or £50. If you refer to the Minister's Annual Report you will find that the mistresses we have at the head of the girls' departments frequently possess very high qualifications, while the infant mistresses in very many cases have never got above the lowest grade of scholarship.

209. Can you express an opinion upon the wisdom of the conditions of the suggested scale as regards certificates?—In starting the certificates in small schools at E2, I am of opinion that 2 is too high a qualification. Very few indeed—practically none—of the teachers who occupy these positions can possibly expect to have so high a qualification as 2.

210. Do I understand you to say you disapprove of this?—Yes; at the beginning they start too high in the No. 2. It is too high a qualification. That ought to come down to 3 at least. For D2 I should put D3, and for D1 I should have D2.

211. How would your remarks apply to the markings of any certificates in schools of 250 to 600 children?—I think C1 is too high. There are very many good men who have not had opportunities of getting a C qualification, and yet they do the work required of them extremely well. Why should we penalise them?

212. What would you substitute for C1?—I am not prepared to say. I am not clear in my own mind whether C should be kept in or not.

213. Take the certificate D2, on the right-hand side, No. 105: should that stand?—Yes, I think so.

214. Is it not the case that as time passes teachers' certificates might in some instances have to be changed, either by the result of age or neglect of themselves, or other circumstances? For instance, men with a D2 to-day might five years hence be entitled to a lower certificate?—That is quite so. But it is very difficult to frame a regulation that would meet every case.

215. You would not recommend any regulations by which certificates should be revised from time to time?—No; there are great difficulties in the way. After a certain age teachers gradually deteriorate, and, with their certificates revised out of existence, what would become of them in the absence of a superannuation fund? Some Continental schools provide 10 per cent. a week after a teacher has been so many years in the service. We English people do not know how to treat the best servants of the State. There is another point to be noted in connection with the proposed demand for certificates. I think the Inspector-General's system of laying stress on the importance of the numerical qualification of the certificate as against the literary qualification is unjust. He imposes 4 per cent. of a penalty for failure to produce a required certificate of any number—that is, if the teacher's certificate is D3 instead of D2, that teacher is penalised 4 per cent. If he held a D certificate when a C was required, then he would suffer a reduction of only 1 per cent. I understand the Inspector-General's object is to make the teacher ambitious of getting a higher certificate; but his scheme will fail of its purpose, because we have never found the slightest difficulty, even without any certificate requirements whatever, in getting a teacher who has a natural aptitude for the work to improve his number, whereas we find an enormous difficulty in getting him to go from C to B. We find no difficulty in getting them to improve their qualifications from 4 to 3, from 3 to 2, and from 2 to 1; but the difficulty is to get them to go from D to C and from C to B. I would therefore advocate that this provision be expunged, or that the penalty should be made equal.

216. Under the proposed scale, would not the number of our pupil-teachers in North Canterbury be materially increased?—The pupil-teachers will be increased by twenty.

217. Do you think, in the circumstances of the colony, it would be advisable—and certainly so far as North Canterbury is concerned—to increase our pupil-teachers by that number?—Yes, very desirable, as it would give us the opportunity of introducing the reform I laid such stress on in my introductory remarks—the half-time system. And that is not the sole reason of my approval. We need assistants, and we must get them supplied from somewhere, and I do not see any better supply than pupil-teachers.

218. With regard to training-schools, would you advocate the formation of more training-schools in the colony than we now possess?—Yes. It was unanimously agreed upon by the Inspectors' Conference.

219. Do you think there should be training-colleges in each of the large centres of the colony?—Yes, where there are opportunities of university education, and easy access to higher education.

220. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you had any experience in the Otago Educational District?—Yes; I was there for some years before I came to North Canterbury.

221. I understand you take very strong objection to the staff of the smaller schools up to 50?—Yes. I expressed the opinion that it would probably be wiser to postpone the introduction of a mistress to 41 instead of 36, as suggested in the scale. In that case, ninety-eight schools would

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 head-masters 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 head-masters, 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 every-thing 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

and Seventh are frequently combined, in your opinion would it be wise, if possible to do so, to have male teachers in charge of those three groups of standards?—We do have male teachers, and in some of the schools we have mistresses of rather exceptional ability. But we look upon that as an anomalous position for a woman.

239. If you were a headmaster in such a school, and were allowed to select your own staff, would you not prefer to have three males and three females rather than two males and four females?—That would depend upon whether the school is in a normal condition as regards distribution of the pupils in the school. If it is slightly top-heavy, I would say three men; if not, I am quite satisfied with two male assistants and the rest female.

240. As a rule, in such schools, 421 to 480, you find the Fourth Standard probably averages 56: do you think the average woman is, physically speaking, apart from her mental capacity, able to manage a Fourth Standard over 60?—No.

241. In your opinion, it would be wise to alter this slightly to make it allowable to have as many male as female assistants?—I think so; there is no reason why it should not be so. For instance, a mistress, according to the scale, might have to take the Fourth Standard—it might even be the Sixth. We would take care that she must have substantial assistance. The headmaster must have an eye to that. For instance, I would not accept the statement that the headmistress was responsible for errors in her department if she did not have adequate assistance. That is for the headmaster to see to. That is why the headmaster must have a big salary. I expect a good deal from him.

242. Take the second male assistant, the next to the first assistant: what work do you expect him to do?—He may have to teach the Fifth or Sixth Standard, or sometimes the Fourth. In all these schools the staff has to fit in according to the distribution of the children in the standards.

243. Do you think the salary suggested here—£100 per year—is sufficient salary for a man doing that work?—It is a very low salary. I have sympathy with a man who has to teach one of the upper standards at £100 a year.

244. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you regard the teaching of sewing to girls as a branch of technical education?—Distinctly so. Of course, that word "technical" covers a large field. We generally call it "manual training." I think it would be manual training, and it should be well done.

245. Are you satisfied with the teaching of sewing in the district?—I do not set up to be an expert, but I know the difference between excellent, good, fair, and rubbish in this respect.

246. It has been given in evidence that sewing is taught in a number of the schools by persons resident in the neighbourhood—in some cases relations of the Committee. In some cases, I am told, they are the wives of the Chairmen: have you any knowledge of the fact?—Yes, that is so. I do not consider that is satisfactory.

247. Would you approve of a statutory prohibition of that sort of thing?—A very stringent one. I think, as a matter of fact, no persons interested in the School Committee should be allowed to derive any pecuniary benefit from the schools.

248. Are there many of the houses attached to the schools in North Canterbury which have any considerable area of land attached to them?—I really could not say, but I think there are very few indeed of the schoolmasters' residences which have much land attached. The master may have enough land to run his horse, but I should think it was of little advantage from a pecuniary point of view.

249. My reason for asking was that we heard they would not come into the town schools on account of the value of land attached to these country schoolhouses. I believe you recently paid a visit to Great Britain?—Yes.

250. Did you notice any differences in the practice of paying teachers when you left Home?—The difference is in favour of the pupil-teacher mainly. The next most important point was the payment of the headmasters. They had very substantial salaries. It staggered me to think we should be paying men of Mr. Foster's or Mr. Scott's qualifications—men who exercise a great deal of influence on the young people who come under them—such a small salary, and to go to these schools and see the master has such a big salary. Of course, they have to be highly qualified men. A very common salary was £450 to £500. As for the assistant, he is nothing like our assistant here. He never was, in the olden times, very well paid, and his position has improved but little.

251. Do you think that the fact of these great School Boards offering such prizes is doing anything to improve the general status of the profession?—I should think so, undoubtedly.

252. *Mr. Luke.*] Do I understand you to say you would like to see the half-time system of school-teaching extended in the North Canterbury District?—I do not think I have been asked any questions on that subject. We have had very little experience here. I was speaking in regard to pupil-teachers.

253. In respect to the first assistant teachers. We will take one school, 420 to 480. The salary there for the first male assistant would be £190, and £140 for the first female assistant: do you agree with those salaries?—I practically agree with them.

254. Do you not think, from your experience as Inspector for many years, that the infant mistress should be a thoroughly qualified teacher?—Yes, very distinctly. We should have first-class lady teachers in the infant department.

255. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Are you aware that two-thirds of the schools of the colony are those having an average attendance of less than 50?—Yes, I should think so.

256. Do you not think that a scale of staffs and salaries that would be suitably arranged for this class of school should receive the consideration of the Commission?—I think it is done here in this scale. On the whole, I am in favour of this proposed scale. I have talked about the defects, and the improvements I would like to be introduced, but they can very readily be adjusted.

257. Of course, you recognise it would be a difficult thing to adopt any scale that would suit every school?—It is a difficult problem to solve.

258. Do the North Canterbury Education Board consult the Inspectors in reference to any new scheme of payment of salaries?—Are you dealing with the relations of the Inspectors to the Boards, because I have a delicacy in answering such personal questions?

259. On referring to the scale of staffs and salaries adopted by the Board, I find by the Education Report that it means a decrease of salary pretty well all round: is that not so in the large districts?—That must almost necessarily follow. At any rate, the very smallest would be a living-wage, and that is better than ours.

260. And an increased ratio according to the size of the school?—Yes.

261. How do you account for the fact that a teacher in a school of 40 gets a salary of £150, whereas a schoolmaster with an average attendance of 41 comes back to £140?—You pay a man according to his work. The man with 41 has a mistress to help him, and I say the only man with a rosy billet in our profession is the master in a school of 41 with a mistress to assist him.

262. Seeing that the teacher with 40 suffers a reduction when another family comes along and brings the attendance to 41, how is it that the teachers in the other grades suffer no reduction for increased attendance?—At that particular point there is a vast difference in the amount of work devolving upon a single-handed teacher. The increase of work with every increment gets so great that the Otago system, going from 41 to 50, is, in my opinion, barbarous.

263. Do you not consider a teacher would prefer to teach 45 rather than have his salary reduced by £10?—I think that is true of all the teachers in our circuit. Their views and mine coincide. I do not mean to say that their views agree with the scale as it stands; but according to their views and mine at the present moment, paying a substantial increase for a unit increase in attendance between 35 and 41, and allowing them monitorial assistance, they would sooner go on working the school single-handed at that stage.

264. Can you name any other walk in life in which a journeyman would have his salary reduced when an assistant is brought in?—The assistant is brought in to take the work off his shoulders—to do a very substantial amount of his work. His work is reduced out of all sight compared to the difficulty he had before. At 40 the master is teaching eight classes at different stages of attainment, and he has got to keep those classes always going. He has to work a very difficult time-table. At 41, instead of having 41 children to deal with, he has 15 to 18; the mistress has taken more than half off his hands, and he has twice the amount of pleasant leisure. In the first place, he has to teach 41 children; in the other, 15.

265. Then, was the Board consistent in drawing up its scheme which makes no reduction when an additional assistant or pupil-teacher is appointed for every increase?—There is a large responsibility attaching to some of these positions. The difference in work as you put on each increment is very slight compared to the difference at the stage at 41.

266. With the system of classification and grouping allowed now in the standards, is it not possible for a teacher to teach more than he did a few years ago?—I think it is, and if the Inspector-General carries out the recommendation made by the Inspectors' Conference it will be easier yet; but that does not alter the position, that even then, with any number above 41 in a single-handed school, the master is asked to do too much.

267. You are in favour of equal pay for equal work?—No; considering the social and economic conditions under which we live, it is impossible to think of that.

268. Do you consider it advisable to substitute one assistant for two pupil-teachers, where such can be done in a large school?—We have done it very frequently.

269. Then, does the North Canterbury Board encourage or give facilities for the transfer of teachers from one part of the district to another?—I have not heard of such a thing.

270. Where there is a vacancy in a large school is it advertised?—The practice has been growing up for the Committees of the city schools practically to appoint their assistants; but it is one to be condemned.

271. Does your Board encourage applications from other educational districts?—Practically, we have a system of "protection" in force here.

272. Would not the adoption of a colonial scale of salaries do away with that sort of thing?—It would largely. I do not say we do not supply very valuable teachers to other districts.

273. Are you in favour of the separation of the sexes in large town schools?—If the organization depended on me, and I were not trammelled by old traditions, I should never think of it.

274. Would you favour the differentiation of the syllabus as regards the amount of work required to be done in small country schools and that expected in larger-staffed schools?—Oh, yes.

275. Do you favour a scheme of superannuation?—Yes.

276. You mentioned that you did not think it was possible for the Education Boards to do so, but that the Government should do so?—I think I offered that opinion, but I should think it was a departmental matter. They have instituted a Deferred Annuity Fund at Home quite recently, and the scheme they have put on foot might readily be brought into operation here.

277. *Mr. Smith.*] You mentioned that you objected to sewing-mistresses having anything to do with the Committee: would your remarks also apply to pupil-teachers?—No.

278. *Mr. Hill.*] Assuming that a colonial scale were adopted, do you think that the appointments which would follow such a scale should be made by the Education Board, or should they become colonial?—I am of opinion that the Board ought still to keep that measure of authority.

279. Would you explain how promotions could take place unless on a colonial scale? If you have a colonial scale, would you expect promotions to take place according to education districts?—No, I see no difficulty whatever. Everything depends upon the scheme the Board has for making these appointments; but the Board must be trusted to some extent if it exists at all.

280. Are you in favour of wiping out the Boards altogether?—Assuming that the factors which determine the successful working of our schools have ten points assigned as the measure of their

importance, then I would apportion these points as follows: Scale of staff and salaries, five points; appointment of teachers, two points; control of inspectorate, two points; all other matters, one point. If, then, the Boards are to retain any real influence on the working of the schools they cannot afford to be shorn of any more of their powers than the control of the staff and salaries.

281. You are opposed to a system of promotion by Government?—Promotion could be quite well assured under the Boards.

282. You have had large experience in the smaller schools in your district: you have men and women in charge of those schools?—We have about fifty of each. We have a hundred such schools. They are all certificated teachers, except in very small aided schools, where two or three householders in the district appoint their own teachers.

283. Which possess the higher qualifications, the women or men?—Latterly the men are much better qualified than the women, but in my opinion it is more fitting for a woman to work these small schools. A woman at £100 is an infinitely superior being to a man in the same position. My own experience is that up to 25 a woman can work a school admirably. I would rather have the woman than the man, considering the salary.

284. Do you expect equal work from her?—Quite as good, and in many cases better than the men.

285. On the average, do they do equal work?—We have some excellent young fellows in some of these positions, which were of much greater importance when they were filled, for the attendance has fallen off very much. They can beat the average woman hollow, but they ought not to be there. They ought to be at something better. To give a man of that stamp £110 is scandalous. On the other hand, we can get plenty of good lady teachers for these positions who are well paid at £100.

286. On page 29 of the appendix to Inspector's Report you have the result of the schools in your district in charge of women, and, as far as I can see, they do certainly as well as the men?—We have plenty of men at the present time who beat the average woman hollow, but they ought to be occupying higher positions.

287. Up to 25, seeing you require the man and woman to do the same work, do you expect the woman to do the work at a cheaper rate than you expect a man to do it?—Certainly; the social and economic conditions under which we live make it necessary we should make some difference in salary.

288. Do you differentiate between the salaries of married and single men?—I am not prepared to answer the question in that way; but when a man enters the profession he does so for life, and to induce good men to enter it you must pay them better salaries than the women. You can get the women, and they are handsomely paid compared with women in other walks of life. When a woman enters the profession it is not on the same understanding as a man. She, in nine cases out of ten, hopes to take up another profession inside five years.

289. Do you think a man can control more children than a woman?—Yes.

290. In formulating a scale you also think a man should receive a higher salary than a woman?—Yes.

291. Supposing the suggested classification of the department were modified in this way, as has been suggested—that you allow a woman in charge of a school up to 35, and between 35 and 45 a man—do you think such an arrangement would be beneficial?—No; I oppose that distinctly.

292. You said just now that a teacher in a school up to 45 has very difficult work compared with a teacher in a large school with a class of 60 children: do you really consider, from your experience, that a man in a school of 45 has a more difficult task than a teacher with a class of 60?—I am tremendously impressed with the difficulties of a man teaching a school at 45 single-handed, compared with a teacher with a class of 60. The latter's work is child's play compared with the former's.

293. Say there are 1,500 minutes in a week, which would you say had the most opportunity of impressing his character upon the children in his care—the teacher in a class of 60, or the master in charge of a school of 35?—The relations between a man and his class in a large school and a teacher single-handed and his pupils in a small school are materially different. It is wonderful how a mistress in a small school will enter into every feature of the daily lives of the children; whereas the teacher in the town knows very little about the lives of his pupils outside the four walls of his class-room. The mistress in a country school will know every little bit about the children, and endear herself to them in many ways. But do not make any mistake: the teacher in a single-handed school with a large attendance has the hardest time of any member of the teaching profession. You are asking about the teacher impressing his individuality on the children—one with a group of 60 and the other in a school of 35. Look at the difference in the conditions under which they do their work. The man with the class of 60 has time—we might almost say leisure—to pursue any train of thought that his lesson may suggest for the benefit of the children, and lay it clearly before them; but what chance has the other man of following out any train of thought in the treadmill round that keeps him in perpetual restraint? His mind is ever distracted with the thought of the immediate pressing needs of his many classes.

294. Supposing you have a school of 30 to 35 children, how many of those would be in standards on the average?—They might all be in standards. In Russell's Flat we had all the children attending the school in standards—34 or 36; but that is an exceptional case. In a school of 30 in our district 25 would be in standards perhaps, and 5 in the preparatory division.

295. What is your proportion in the larger schools, of children in the preparatory classes?—We would look upon a classification of two-thirds of the pupils in Standards II. to VII. and one-third in Standard I. and Preparatory as normal.

296. The smaller schools have a larger proportion in standards than your larger schools?—Yes; they do not come to school as babies. They have to travel too far,

297. The smaller schools in some standards have larger classes relatively?—Yes; the women can do that kind of work most beautifully, but not above 25 to 30.

298. And yet you insist they get a smaller salary than the men?—I would not have a man there.

299. Yet they do equal work?—A man should not be there. If he is not fit for a higher position he had better give way to a woman.

300. *Mr. Hogben.*] Am I right in supposing that, apart from the question of finance, you would lower still further the number—35—that would be placed in charge of a single-handed teacher?—Yes, I think so.

301. If the number were increased from 35 to 40, is it your opinion that the work would become more mechanical?—It always becomes more mechanical as it increases at these stages.

302. And still more mechanical if you increase it to 45?—I cannot imagine anything more likely to produce mental sterility than that form of work.

303. Even if the teacher's purse did not suffer, the children would suffer?—Yes.

304. As regards some of the difficulties that have been suggested as to the sudden break in the style of work when a mistress is introduced, do you not think the differentiation of the syllabus would have a good effect?—You mean when the syllabus is amended in the direction of relieving small schools, and still maintaining a full syllabus in schools in which two adult teachers were employed? That would not be sufficient compensation for a man working under a reduced syllabus in the small school single-handed.

305. But would not that modify the position of a man working single-handed under a reduced syllabus?—You could modify it to a very large extent with regard to the difficulty of the work; but there is no modification ever likely to be carried out in this colony that will make the work of the single-handed teacher ever approach ease. A man who is working with a mistress in a school of 45 has one of the rosiest billets in the profession. No differentiation of the syllabus will ever do away with the vast difference in the tasks imposed on these two classes of teachers.

306. The differentiation of the syllabus increasing the amount of work to be done in each standard would also to a certain extent affect the argument for reduction of salary?—It would, inasmuch as it makes his task not such a hard one. Still, there is a limit to what you can reduce the amount; you must pay a man a salary he can live on.

307. The argument for reducing the salary from 40 to 41, reducing it by £10 for an increase of one pupil: that argument would, to some extent, be modified if you increased the amount of work in the syllabus?—It would; but, as a matter of fact, you will not increase the work.

308. If the school drops, his salary goes up £10?—When he loses the mistress he has to work to teach the whole of the standards and infants instead of the four upper ones. Instead of teaching 15 pupils in four classes, he is asked to teach 38 or 40 in seven classes; therefore his salary goes up, as he is asked to do work enormously more difficult.

309. One point was raised in the questions asked by Mr. Davidson, regarding schools whose average was between 420 and 480. He spoke of the allocation of the staff to different classes. He spoke of the average in Standard IV. being 60 or 70. I find the average is 56, and of Standard V. the average is 50; Standard VI., 44; Standard VII., 17, in schools of that size. How many pupil-teachers does the proposed scale allow?—Five.

310. How many of those will you employ in the infant-room of schools of that kind if you had these mistresses available?—I think, in those schools we should probably have two pupil-teachers employed in the infant classes.

311. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is the average attendance of pupils in the infant department in such schools below Standard I.?—I should think, about 120.

312. You would have a mistress in the infant department, a junior, and one pupil-teacher?—According to this scale, we can staff that school admirably and have to spare; we can have one assistant and one pupil-teacher over.

313. There is no necessity for having another master?—No; the headmaster himself is quite capable of giving due assistance to a mistress when needed. There would be no fear of weakness in that staff of three pupil-teachers, two male assistants and two female assistants, and headmaster in the upper school.

314. *Mr. Hogben.*] In spite of many criticisms, you hold with the main principles of the scale?—Yes, I do.

315. *The Chairman.*] With regard to pupil-teachers, do you have much difficulty in obtaining suitable applicants?—The difficulty exists in getting suitable male applicants. We have no difficulty in getting females.

316. I presume there is a good deal of pressure on the part of the parents?—No; I think the girls seem to take to it themselves. The parents may have a little to do with it, but I do not think any of our headmasters would say that the parents urged the girls. The masters would object to having such a class of pupil-teachers forced on them.

317. Then, you have more applications for these positions than the Board can satisfy?—Not as regards boys, but as regards girls we have.

318. In your opinion, why is it there are so few applications from boys?—You must offer inducements to men to enter the profession. This scale has the splendid advantage of bettering the position of the pupil-teacher enormously, both from the financial point of view and by making life much more pleasant for him, and by holding out a prospect that by-and-by there is a good solid position he can attain to in a good profession.

319. Do you think, if the rate of pay for the lower branches of the profession was somewhat increased, it would induce more boys to enter the profession as pupil-teachers?—It will distinctly have that tendency, together with the increased facilities for equipping themselves well in scholarship, and with the great reduction in the hardships they will have to endure in actual teaching.

320. Do I understand, from what you say, that pupil-teachers when first starting have hard work?—Yes, very hard.

321. Do you think it is too much to expect pupil-teachers to attend to their duties in the school, assist in the teaching during school-hours, and at the same time pursue their studies and prepare lessons after school-hours?—I think so, very decidedly.

322. Are there not cases where their health has broken down under the strain?—I have heard of cases, but I think the outside public are of opinion that they are more numerous than is really the case.

323. Is it your opinion that at the present time the profession is not inviting the best class of applicants?—Yes; I think we might induce more men to enter the profession.

324. Do you consider the large number of the junior teachers are underpaid?—No; the rank and file of the profession are all well paid for the duties they discharge. It is the headmasters and pupil-teachers who are underpaid.

325. You said you considered a teacher in a school of about 40 or under, having no assistant, was one of the hardest-worked men in the profession?—He is the hardest.

326. And, on the other hand, the teacher with a larger number, and with the assistance of a mistress, has a comparatively easy position?—Yes; the positions of the two form a marked contrast.

327. Under those circumstances, do you think it fair that a hardworking teacher in a smaller school, without any assistance, should be paid less salary than a teacher with about 10 or 15 more, and the assistance of a mistress?—No.

328. In that respect you differ from the colonial scale?—I do indeed.

329. Some reference has been made to some of the aided or household schools in certain districts where teachers have to be employed. You stated you thought no capitation should be granted in any case where the number was less than 10?—I said I had a little difficulty in answering that question. There might be such exceptional circumstances in other parts of New Zealand as to warrant provision being made for schools of that class, but I think there ought to be some limit to what the State should pay, or else you would be flooded with applications for capitation grants. It would entail an enormous expense, and would swamp the best system in the world. It would cost between £70,000 and £80,000.

330. But you would not be averse to the Education Department assisting families in such places as the Sounds, where they are isolated, and unless they receive assistance the children would be practically uneducated?—I will give you an example of an instance of this kind that I approve of. I once spent a Christmas holiday in a lighthouse in this district. The Board subsidised the families in that lighthouse for three or four years, and the Inspector went there regularly. There were two families there, the lighthouse-keeper's and the under-lighthouse-keeper's. I would call that an exceptional case.

331. In reference to sewing-mistresses, why do you think the wives or daughters of Committeemen should not have the position of sewing-mistress?—Because that class of labour brought into the school is an error. Besides, we want to strengthen the teacher's position wherever possible.

332. But if it happened that this wife or daughter were really the best sewing-mistress that could be appointed?—Ninety-nine times out of a hundred the schoolmaster's wife will be better qualified. The appointment should not go past the teacher's wife.

333. Do you think that in small country schools male teachers are better than females?—In small country schools, up to a certain limit, I would say the female teacher was better. The male teacher is more able to cope with the difficulties of an increased attendance in that class of school, but up to a certain number I would prefer a female teacher; she is better qualified for the position than any male you are likely to get at the salary.

334. You expressed an opinion that, while a male teacher enters the profession for life, it does not apply to female teachers: that is not invariably the case?—Oh, no; you have women entering the profession on the same footing as men; but the presumption is that they enter the profession on a different understanding.

335. In that case you would not be opposed to the female teacher, say, in a country neighbourhood teaching a small school receiving a fair living-wage, just the same as the man?—I should hope there would be no scheme ever come into existence that would not provide for a living-wage for mistresses in country schools. The wages paid in some classes of small country schools are really substantial, more than enough. With us the salary might be cut down somewhat. And, again, the practice adopted in some other districts of paying a mistress £150 to work a school of 45 single-handed would never meet with my approval.

SATURDAY, 11TH MAY, 1901.

R. J. PAULL, Chairman of Richmond School Committee, examined.

Mr. Paull: I wish to give evidence in regard to the small amount the schools get for incidental allowances. I have taken the figures for the Richmond School for the last three years. The average amount per year that we have received from the Board has been £130, in addition to £9 rent for the schoolroom, making a total average for two years of £139 per year. On the other side, we have expended—On the caretaker, £90; scavengering, £6; coals, £13; stationery, £19; repairs, £13; school requisites, £6: making a total of £147. For the last three years we have always had a debit balance of about £8. Of course, a great many items in the Board's school schedule we cannot possibly carry out. In a large school like Richmond it should have a caretaker's cottage. We are at a disadvantage because we have to pay a caretaker £90 a year, whereas if we had a cottage for the caretaker we would save about £30 a year. I should like to impress

upon the Commission that my Committee thinks that the incidental allowance is not near enough for such a large school as Richmond, with an attendance of a little over 500.

336. *The Chairman.*] Is that a roll or an average attendance?—There were a little over 600 on the roll at the end of last quarter. I will admit that the Board of Education always treated us very fairly, but we cannot expect them to give us what they have not got.

337. Have you anything else to add?—I have noted that Boards of Education seem inclined to take away a lot of the power of the Committees. One matter is the appointment of the pupil-teachers. We have to pay the cost of advertising, and we have no power in the appointment of pupil-teachers.

338. Are you consulted by the Board?—No, we simply recommend those pupils that are recommended by the headmaster. There is great feeling amongst School Committees in regard to this question.

339. Is your grievance with the headmaster or the Board?—We certainly think that if applications are sent in to us we should make the choice. Of course, we would not appoint any one we did not think was qualified for the position. Furthermore, headmasters have their favourites to put in, and we think that is wrong.

340. I presume it is the headmaster you find fault with?—Yes, that is so. The Board has given the headmaster power to do so.

341. Have you never made any effort to nominate a pupil-teacher without consulting the headmaster?—No; I never would, because I would have a little conscience with regard to the pupil-teacher. The headmaster is in a position to make it very warm for a pupil-teacher appointed against his wish. That is a grievance that School Committees have. Then, there is a rumour amongst School Committeemen that there is a likelihood of Boards being done away with. I should be very sorry to have such a thing attempted, because I believe that Boards of Education throughout the colony are doing splendid work. I do not believe in centralisation. I think that the North Canterbury Board of Education is doing splendid work, and has always treated the Richmond School very fairly.

342. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] In Otago, for a school the same size as yours, they only pay their caretaker £42 a year?—We have no caretaker's cottage at Richmond, and I cannot see how we could possibly reduce the incidental expenditure at Richmond.

343. Does your school take up the whole time of the caretaker?—Yes. We have three large buildings, and we have accommodation for 200 more children than are at present attending the school.

344. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you compared the allowances of School Committees in North Canterbury with those of other educational districts in the colony?—No; we have only heard that the allowances are smaller in Otago than here, but I do not think they do so much in regard to the school-grounds. I was in Wellington a little while ago, and the schools there are nothing to be compared with the schools here as regards tidiness.

345. Would you be surprised to know that the school allowance in North Canterbury is more liberal than in any other school district in New Zealand?—I have heard it.

346. Have you ever visited other suburban schools about Christchurch?—I have.

347. Have you visited the Waltham?—Yes.

348. Were you struck with the great tidiness of the surroundings of the school?—Yes; but I think the Richmond School will be compared to any school in the whole of North Canterbury.

349. You say your Board allowance is £130, and rent brings your total receipts up to £139: are you aware that in a similar school in Otago—between 500 and 550—the allowance made by the Board is £85 per year, which is £54 less than that paid by the North Canterbury Board to your Committee?—All I can say is that they cannot possibly do all that we do here.

350. Have you any other means of income than the actual amount paid by the Board and the £9 of rent?—Yes; we have the Richmond Bath, and it brought us in an income of about £35 this last year.

351. Are you aware that in Otago, in addition to the allowance made by the Board, the Committees raise a considerable amount of money from outside sources for the maintenance of their schools?—Yes; and the Richmond School has done better than any other district in and around Christchurch. We raised £700 some eight years ago. The construction of the baths cost £1,050, and we raised £700 of it. On one item alone—asphalting—we spent £20.

352. *Mr. Stewart.*] Are you aware that a school in Auckland, half as large again as the one you mention, receives £95 from the Board, and out of that it not only pays the current expenses of the school, but also finds slates, pencils, blotting-paper, foolscap, pens and ink for the pupils of the school?—I should be surprised to hear that.

353. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long have you been Chairman of the Committee?—I have been Chairman of the Committee about seven years, and I have been Chairman on one previous occasion.

354. Are there any exceptional circumstances in connection with the school?—Part of the school is an old wooden building—two of the buildings, in fact.

355. Your Committee has paid allowance according to the schedule of the Board?—Yes.

356. In the appointment of pupil-teachers is preference given to females by the headmaster?—Yes.

357. So that they will teach sewing?—I do not know. At the present time I have put in a boy, although the headmaster prefers a girl there. There ought to be a boy in that school.

358. Are there too many girls?—Yes. Some of these girls wait two years for a vacancy, and the headmaster thinks himself bound to appoint them to a vacancy after waiting so long.

359. Is it your experience that males are discouraged from entering the teaching profession?—Yes; that is my experience for the last five years.

360. Is the caretaker related to any member of the School Committee?—No.

361. Does the Education Board consult the Committee in making appointments: do they send all the applications for the position to you?—No, only six.

362. Do they generally abide by the recommendation of the Committee?—Always.

363. *Mr. Weston.*] You have a large piece of ground attached to the Infant School, have you not?—Yes, I believe there must be 2 acres; we are always spending money on shingle.

364. There is a considerable expense not only in regard to these grounds in shingling, but otherwise?—Yes; that is where our money is going.

365. *Mr. Hogben.*] Does the 50th section of the Education Act of 1877 give the Committee any voice in the appointment of pupil-teachers?—No.

366. *The Chairman.*] Will you be surprised to learn that the schools in Wellington of a larger magnitude only get half the allowance that you receive?—I would be surprised; but the city schools there have no ground to keep in repair; and, as I told you before, I would be very sorry to belong to a Committee in charge of a school in such a state as I saw in Wellington—the Clyde Quay School especially.

W. J. Boyce, Master of the Mount Grey Downs School, and representing some of the Small Country-school Teachers, examined.

Mr. Boyce: With regard to the colonial scale, we would like that once and for all there should be some fixity and certainty of salary, and not so many changes and fluctuations. The certificates required are too high. For instance, in a school of 19 to 35 an E2 is required; and in 35 to 75, D2. We think that that D2, as suggested by the Inspector yesterday, might be reduced to D3 at 75 to 100. Then, with regard to a fixed minimum wage, at the present time it is almost impossible for the teachers in the smaller country schools to put by anything for old age. The salary that they do get has so much to be deducted from it, especially if the teacher is anxious to push himself on. I would like to point out in this connection that the great bulk of the teachers are in schools of under 50, and therefore have very little reasonable hope of gaining positions where they can save a fair amount, and cause them to have no worry about the future. Then, as to loss of salary through no fault of the teacher's own, we think it is specially hard in the smaller country schools, and particularly when so many holidays are given for sports meetings of various kinds, and the school is kept open. Here it may be noticed that if the attendance is bad his salary drops, because he has been working. It would pay him better to ask the Committee for a holiday. We lose considerably if we happen to have just over half the average present. Then, the country teachers like to get to town for the purpose of studying, and also for library and social conditions. If the suggested scale is carried into effect this desire becomes all the greater, as the certificate required is made higher; and then the difficulties of country teachers are more pronounced. They can advance in division, but the main difficulty is to advance in class. I think it is very unfair also that a master should have to suffer the loss of £10 because a sewing-mistress is appointed to his school. As was pointed out yesterday, a great evil that has grown up in the country schools is the appointment of a relative of a member of the School Committee to take the sewing class. In this connection we would like a decree absolute to come from the department that the master's wife, if available, should get the preference as sewing-mistress. Now, with regard to another matter—the conveyance of children: I believe this system has been largely adopted in Victoria, and as people are becoming acquainted with its conditions they are taking an increasing liking to it. The saving in this connection would be much greater, especially when technical subjects are introduced. For instance, if they want to introduce, say, woodwork into country schools, look what an enormous expense it would be to put a workshop on to every little country school. I know of a district near me where there are two schools, the children of which might be conveyed to a common centre, and thus save a very large item. In one case, according to the average of last quarter, 22 children would have to travel only another mile and a quarter or a mile and a half to get to another school. The children attending another school would have to travel only two and a half or three miles in order to attend the same common centre. As regards a mistress of 41, there is some little difference of opinion. I would make a comparison between the suggested scale of the Inspector-General and that suggested by Inspector Wood yesterday—viz., Average 35, £150; average 36, £152 10s.; average 37, £155 10s.; average 38, £159; average 39, £163; average 40, £168: with a monitor with any average attendance from 30 to 40. From the returns before me I find that in Canterbury there are seven schools with an average of from 36 to 40 inclusive. If in these seven schools the standard were made 41 as compared with the suggested colonial standard of 36, a saving would be effected of seven mistresses at £80 a year, making a total of £560. To compensate the master for his extra work he should receive a rise of £2 10s. at 36, and rise per unit. The rise in the seven schools would cause an increased expenditure of £39 10s., and taking the £39 10s. from the £560 a net saving would be left of £521 10s. Also, I think, to partly relieve the work of the teacher, some of the £521 10s. might be devoted towards a monitor from 30 to 40. In this connection I might mention a further method of saving would be effected to the Board if the inspection and training expenses did not come out of capitation grant. At the present time the department pays £500 for inspection and £500 for the training, whereas, in addition to that for these purposes, £2,847 has to come out of the capitation grant. We feel that there should be a uniform method of paying salaries, and the principle of paying direct by the Board should be adopted instead of paying through the School Committee.

367. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] How far should children be conveyed to schools?—In the case of the two schools I spoke of it would involve the conveying in one case of about four miles and a quarter, and in the other they would not have to go more than four miles.

368. Do you think you could get over the difficulty of the demands from people, say, within two miles and a half from the school?—Yes, once they had been educated up to the advantages

they would gain from getting more efficient teaching in a larger school, especially looking to the fact of the introduction of technical education.

369. Would you subsidise the parents to convey the children?—I think that is a matter of arrangement for the Boards.

370. Do you generally approve of the colonial scale that has been submitted, with the exception you have noted?—I cannot say I do as regards the smaller country schools, on account largely of the £10 deduction for a sewing-mistress; and then the classification is altogether too high. On the other hand, I admit it has many excellent points.

371. How many pupils do you think a teacher should have intrusted to his sole charge in order to teach them efficiently?—I think, up to 40 he could manage alone; but I would suggest that from 30 to 40; the saving that could be effected in raising that standard in the colonial scale might go in the direction of employing a monitor.

372. I take it, in the establishment of a colonial scale, your desire is not to pull down those decently paid teachers in moderately sized schools just now?—That is so. We feel that no salaries under £200 can bear pulling down.

373. In granting certificates to and giving appointments to teachers, would you take into account the teacher's accent?—Not at all.

374. Do you not think it is a distinct drawback to children to be taught by a teacher who has acquired that dreadful Whitechapel cockney accent?—I do not quite know what you mean.

375. Well, you may hear a teacher at a tea-party say, "Have some 'kike' now, and you will have the 'gripes' afterwards"?—No; I would not take into consideration accent at all in connection with granting certificates to teachers.

376. In regard to the superannuation scheme, do you think that should be done by the Government or by contributions from the teachers?—I know that the police have a superannuation scheme, and that a man who had been twenty years in the service had close on £1 a week pension.

377. How is that done?—As to details I am not conversant.

378. Do you prefer payment on average attendance or for the number on the roll?—I think it would be better to pay as on the roll-number.

379. Do you think the transfer of teachers should be done by the Boards without consulting the Committees, or how do you think it should be done?—I do not think there should be any compulsory transference. That might lead to complications; but, owing to the system of promotion that largely obtains in the town schools, it is almost impossible for country teachers to gain those positions.

380. Have you no suggestion as to how that should be done, and by what authority?—One way to relieve the pressure would be by granting free passes on the railway, and giving free lectures to enable them to obtain the necessary certificates.

381. You have not thought of any device whereby country teachers could get permanently promoted into the towns?—I am not prepared to say that any system of compulsory transfer would work satisfactorily.

382. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your experience?—I was four years a pupil-teacher in one of the suburban schools; a year was spent in the training-college; about three years assistant master in a small suburban school of about 250; and for the last three years I have been headmaster in sole charge of a school with an average of about 27.

383. Have you considered the proposed scale as far as the position of pupil-teachers is concerned?—Yes, to some extent.

384. Do you approve of the salaries as suggested for pupil-teachers?—Yes, I do, decidedly.

385. You had one year's training?—Yes.

386. Do you approve of the present mode of training teachers in the colony?—It is not exactly in line with the new technical subjects that are being brought into the syllabus.

387. Do you approve of the suggestion of establishing training-colleges in the four large centres of the colony?—Yes.

388. Have you considered the position of an assistant master in a school of 225 to 250 in the suggested scale?—Not very much.

389. What is the salary suggested for the position?—£100 a year.

390. Do you consider that a sufficiently large salary?—It is barely a living-wage, for the reason that the teacher has a great deal of expense. He is attending in most cases lectures, and it costs him a great deal to push himself on and qualify himself for higher positions.

391. You have had three years' experience as headmaster of a small school: have you considered the salary suggested for such a grade of school in the proposed scale?—Yes.

392. Do you notice that the salary rises by units?—Yes.

393. Do you prefer that method of allocation of salary to the method adopted in some districts of having grades, with a fixed salary for each grade?—In schools of from 25 to 30 I think that it would be better to have a fixed minimum wage.

394. Under the suggested scale your salary would increase according to the increase per unit of average attendance?—Yes.

395. And there would be a corresponding decrease on declining attendance?—Yes.

396. Do you prefer that to one such as this, giving a fixed salary from 25 to 30?—The fixed salary is preferable, provided it is considerably raised, and there is nothing deducted for a sewing-mistress.

397. The question of the introduction of assistance to the headmaster at 36 has been mentioned, and you state that you would prefer that the assistance be not introduced until the average had reached 41?—Yes; but I qualified it with the condition that the salary was raised to what we had suggested, and that a monitor should go on between 30 and 40.

398. Touching the question of monitors, suppose such a system as this obtained from the schools between 30 and 50: the headmaster to be allowed the assistance of a monitor, who would be a boy

or girl who had passed through the Sixth Standard of the school; the monitor to understand that he or she would not be trained in any way for the teaching profession, but that the monitor should give assistance to the teacher half a day, and for the other half-day study: do you think that such a monitor would be of as much assistance as a pupil-teacher who had not been through the school as a pupil?—No, I do not. He would be of nearly the same assistance; but the pupil-teacher would be a greater expense. It would entail more work upon the master in having to coach that pupil-teacher before or after school.

399. Then, I understand you prefer the introduction of a certificated teacher at 41 rather than the introduction of a pupil-teacher between 30 and 50?—Certainly.

400. *Mr. Stewart.*] Are teachers in Canterbury being paid through Committees?—I think they are; in many instances they are in favour of being paid direct from the Board.

401. Are you aware of any hardships that have arisen out of the present system?—I know of one case the month before last where the teacher had not received his salary on the 17th of the month, and I heard the following week that he had not got it then.

402. You say that the Canterbury teachers are of opinion that gross abuse arises out of the present system?—Undoubtedly.

403. You mentioned about the attendance on bad days, and said something about the exclusion of the attendance on days when it was below half the roll-number?—Yes.

404. Do you think that half the number on the roll is a satisfactory scale?—Decidedly not.

405. Would less than three-fifths be a more desirable rule?—It would be a great improvement, but I would like to see it three-fourths.

406. Do you find a great many days just above one-half?—Yes.

407. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you think it desirable that every inducement in the way of promotion should be held out to teachers to get as high a certificate as possible?—I think every inducement should be held out to teachers.

408. What difficulties, then, are in the way of getting higher certificates?—We cannot get the college lectures, and we cannot get the benefit of private coaches in town except once a week. It is a herculean task on the part of a country teacher to keep his school going and advance himself in class.

409. In your experience of country schools, is it possible to utilise the system of half-time schools in North Canterbury?—I have had no experience of them.

410. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] I suppose it will surprise you considerably to hear that the proposed new scale will benefit the teachers of Canterbury District as a whole?—I think in most cases it will do so, but I think there are some it will press very heavily on. For instance, it is very unjust to some of the assistant masters in suburban schools, and it is very hard on the country schools in deducting £10 for a sewing-mistress—that is one of its greatest evils—and also that a mistress going on in a country school at 36 gets no increase up to an average of 75.

411. According to the scale adopted by the North Canterbury Board, an increase of £10 10s. is given on the proposed scale: do not all the teachers under 50 get a corresponding increase in salary?—I note the actual increase at 29; the suggested colonial scale gives a salary of £138, counting the £10 deducted for the sewing-mistress. Taking that off, the salary is left at £128, as against £127 10s. at present, or an actual increase of 10s.

412. You consider that the sewing-mistress is of no assistance to the teacher, as the teacher has to teach all the classes in his school all the same?—That is so.

413. You realise the fact that teachers in different education districts have not the same opportunity of obtaining higher certificates?—I do.

414. Are you in favour of the proposed system to penalise teachers who have certificates lower than a higher minimum?—No.

415. Do you not consider that would place them rather much in the hands of Inspectors, seeing that 4 per cent. will be deducted for figure and only 1 per cent. for letter?—I do not know that they mind in many cases being put in the hands of the Inspector. We feel that the Inspectors have treated us very fairly.

416. Has your experience been that the assignment of marks by Inspectors has been satisfactory to the teachers in raising the classification?—I can only speak for myself.

417. I understand you represent a considerable number of country teachers?—I have not got their experience. As regards promotion, we would like unity of promotion throughout the colony.

418. You could secure that, no doubt, if the Inspectors were placed in a central department?—I think, to a certain extent, the Inspectors meeting in conference would meet that case.

419. With regard to the syllabus, do you not consider that a somewhat lower standard of work might be accepted in country schools where the teacher is unaided to what is expected from the town schools with larger staffs?—Yes; the teacher's time is so much divided that a reduction in the number of subjects is very desirable.

420. Do you consider the proposed scale is equitable when the salary is reduced by £10 when the sewing-mistress comes on?—No, I do not.

421. You could not mention any occupation or trade where a journeyman is reduced in pay when an assistant is brought in on account of increased work?—No, I could not.

422. A sewing-mistress is not expected to do any of the other work of the school in a North Canterbury district?—No.

423. Seeing that freedom of classification is allowed now, and that there is greater opportunity to group classes, how many pupils do you consider that a sole male teacher can teach efficiently?—Up to 40, provided he gets that extra pay for the work that Mr. Wood suggested.

424. Do you not consider that the system of employing monitors is very liable to abuse?—In many cases I was inclined to think it was like employing child-labour; but in many cases children

pass the Sixth Standard, and for two years they have nothing to do, and if the children were able to put in those two years at the school earning a little money parents would be quite agreeable.

425. You are in favour of building up the salary, and not reducing those that are getting higher salaries than will be paid under the scale if adopted?—We have no wish to reduce the upper ones in bringing up the lower ones.

426. You are in favour of establishing collegiate schools and the conveyance of country teachers at a cheap rate to improve their classification?—Decidedly.

427. You are aware that over two-thirds of the schools of the colony have an average attendance of less than 50?—Yes.

428. Do you not think that these schools should receive every consideration at the hands of the department?—Yes.

429. Are you in favour of equal pay for equal work, and paying females as nearly as possible the same as males?—Although in theory equal pay for equal work is excellent, still I think that the present economic and social conditions are not quite ready for such a change being made. I think the difference between the salaries of male and female should, however, be minimised.

430. Ten per cent. difference?—I would not be prepared to say that.

431. Do you not consider that the Board has been rather liberal in the establishment of smaller schools?—Decidedly.

432. And that necessitates paying smaller salaries than otherwise they would be able to pay?—Yes; and the demand for these smaller schools would diminish if the parents were educated up to the point of conveying the children to larger schools.

433. You think it better that a minimum should be fixed by the department for the establishment of the schools, and thus relieve the Board from pressure?—Yes.

434. *Mr. Hill.*] What is your salary under the present regulations of the North Canterbury Board?—At the rate of £106 per year for the last quarter.

435. Under the proposed scale your salary would be materially benefited?—It would be £124 *minus* the £10 for a sewing-mistress, an actual increase of £8.

436. Supposing a lady had a school beside you, with the same attendance, and doing the same kind of work, and producing the same kind of results, would you like her to have the same salary—that is, do you not think she ought to get the same salary for doing the same work as efficiently as yourself?—In those cases I am prepared to say that she should receive equal payment.

437. Supposing you had some Seventh Standard pupils in your school, and in order to encourage you to stay at your school a bonus were to be given for the instruction of Seventh Standard pupils, do you think that would tend to benefit smaller country schools, and tend to keep good pupils in these schools?—I do not think it would benefit the small country schools under a sole teacher, for very few stay after the Sixth Standard.

438. Do you not think it would tend to keep the children at school a little longer if the parents understood that the children would receive further instruction than is requisite for the Sixth Standard merely?—It would tend slightly to do that.

439. Do you think it would benefit the teachers in charge of these schools who are occupied in giving such advanced instruction?—Without knowing how it would work out I could scarcely say.

440. Could you tell me how long it would take a teacher to obtain D1?—No, I cannot give a definite opinion as to how long. It depends upon the teachers themselves—in some cases seventeen years. I have no definite experience on that point; the seventeen years I mention is only an isolated case.

441. Do you think the teachers would be willing to have ½ per cent. deducted from the capitation allowance which the Government proposes to grant in order to have a superannuation fund established?—I think so, if a suitable amount for a retiring-allowance were provided.

442. *Mr. Hogben.*] You said that you had a preference for the scheme sketched by Inspector Wood for the increased pay to masters between 35 and 40?—Yes.

443. That increase would make the salary of the headmaster of a single school at 40 £168?—It would.

444. The suggested scale would give him £153?—Yes.

445. So that Mr. Wood's scale would give him an increase of £15?—Yes.

446. When you get to 41 would you make that salary £15 more than the scale gives: although it seems a higher position to get a mistress, the man has to work less, and you would reduce his salary £15?—I think the £15 is too big a drop, and it seems rather hard on the master when he has got to 41 to suffer such a loss of salary.

447. Are you aware that half the schools in the colony are below 35?—I know that two-thirds are under 50.

448. If you add £15 to each it will mean a considerable sum, will it not?—Yes.

449. Would you be prepared to provide that money by taking it from somewhere else?—Part of it would be saved by reducing the number of mistresses at £80.

450. With regard to the master suffering a loss of £10 for a sewing-mistress, giving preference to the master's wife?—Yes.

451. Are there many married country school-teachers?—Most of the Committees demand that they shall be married.

452. Are you acquainted well enough with those teachers who are married to know whether their wives are qualified to teach sewing?—I think nearly all of them are.

453. So that in the case of married teachers the £10 would not go out of the family?—If the rule were absolute from the department that they were to get the preference.

454. Unmarried men's expenses are not so high as married men's expenses?—I should say not, as a general rule.

455. Supposing that the employment of a monitor were one way of lessening the master's work when a school reached 40, and simplification of the syllabus were another way of solving the difficulty: in the interest of the children, which do you think would be the better way—to simplify the syllabus or employ a monitor?—I think, as I am teaching all the subjects at present, I should prefer to have the assistance of a monitor.

456. Do you not think that simplification of the syllabus by requiring fewer subjects in schools with a sole teacher unaided would relieve the work to a very considerable extent?—Yes, I do.

457. So that you might not have to consider the employment of a monitor either?—Possibly it might.

458. *The Chairman.*] Do you suggest that the children of settlers in the country should receive a less efficient description of primary education than the children of people in the towns?—Not at all.

459. You would like to see them placed in an equal position?—As far as possible.

460. Then, with regard to salaries, do you think the minimum provided in the scheme that has been submitted is sufficient?—No, I do not, especially for the assistant mistresses in the country schools; it is not a living-wage.

461. If that applies to mistresses, does it not also apply to masters?—Yes.

462. What do you think would be a reasonable minimum for teachers in small country schools?—I prefer not to state a definite sum, but I think it should be raised.

463. Do you think masters or mistresses should be paid less than £2 per week?—Decidedly not. I understand that a third-class butcher gets £2 1s. a week, a second-class butcher £2 10s., a first-class butcher £3 5s., and, I think, surely a teacher in charge of a school is worth a higher rate of wages than a third-class butcher.

464. Do you think that teachers should be paid on strict average attendance, or according to their experience and competence—in other words, do you think that teachers should be liable to suffer from circumstances over which they have no control, such as weather, migration of families, stoppage of industries, sports and celebrations, and epidemics?—Decidedly not.

465. And you do not think that because a family happens to arrive in the district the salary of the master should be suddenly raised, or that because a family leaves the district the salary should be reduced?—It is very seldom that a family comes into a district, and I have not considered that aspect.

466. You said before that you will take the rises, but do not want the falls?—Yes; the salaries are so small that we cannot afford the falls.

467. Is there any other means by which you can suggest that the country teachers shall have fair-play in the way of getting the advantages to be secured through attending the large centres?—That we should have the opportunity of working back to town—the system of promotion at present bars us. The vacancies in the towns are advertised, but the assistants lower down get the preference.

C. D. Hardie, Headmaster of Ashburton School, and representing the Inland Town Schools, examined.

468. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is your present position?—Headmaster of the Ashburton Borough School.

469. What is the average attendance?—347 last quarter.

470. It will come into the grade 330 to 390?—Yes.

471. Is it an ordinary primary school?—Yes.

472. Have you studied carefully the allotted staff to this school under the suggested scale?—The staff, according to this scale, would be very much better than it is at present. There would be one more pupil-teacher and one more assistant.

473. Then, you prefer the staffing under the suggested scale to that obtaining at present?—In that grade of school.

474. Have you considered the proposed salaries allotted to that grade of school?—If the pupil-teacher-instruction money were to come off, my own salary would be reduced some £7 or £8.

475. Do you think the advantages of having a colonial scale of salary would outweigh the drop of £7 or £8 a year?—Personally, I am quite willing to drop the £7 to see an equitable scale brought in.

476. Taking the salaries of assistants as suggested here, how do they compare with the salaries received by your assistants?—The first assistant gets a distinct rise of about £40.

477. Do you consider the position of first male assistant to a large school an important one?—I do, decidedly.

478. Do you consider the suggested salary too high for that position?—No, I think not.

479. And the other assistants, how do they compare?—There is a slight increase there too.

480. All round?—Yes.

481. *Mr. Stewart.*] Have the salaries here been permanent for seven or eight years?—There have been several alterations.

482. Do you feel a tolerable certainty that no further reductions will take place?—No.

483. Would not the permanency of a colonial scale put the teachers safer in position?—It would be a slight advantage.

484. They would be prepared to pay a slight insurance for permanancy by a drop of £7?—I would not speak definitely. I consider that even with this scheme teachers are underpaid as compared with other professions. If a man who works up to the position of headmaster in a town school had given the same time, enthusiasm, and brain-work to any other profession into which he

might have gone, his position at thirty-five or forty would be very much better than his position in charge of a school.

485. You have heard statements about paying teachers' salaries through Committees?—Yes; I think they should be paid direct.

486. Do you think that the headmaster's wife should have the preference of teaching sewing?—Certainly; but I do not believe that £10 should be taken off because a mistress is brought in.

487. Do you believe in a condition being laid down that, all things being equal, the headmaster's wife should be the teacher of sewing?—Yes, it would be very much better.

488. Do you know of any difficulty arising through an outside teacher of sewing being employed?—I have not had sufficient experience of schools of that size.

489. Do you think the present rule for calculating the working-average is high enough: would it not be better to be fixed at three-fifths?—It is not right at present, because a quarter frequently occurs where for ten or fifteen days the attendance has been one or two above the half, owing to an epidemic or something of that kind. The average accordingly comes down, and teachers suffer thereby.

490. You are aware that this was inserted some years ago with a view of obviating a fall in teachers' salaries by reason of epidemics?—Yes.

491. Has it had that effect?—No.

492. Therefore the rule should be placed on a higher basis?—Yes.

493. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you think that the periodical introduction and adoption of the new salary-scales by the different Boards is inimical to the interests of true education?—I think it is, decidedly.

494. You would rather have a fixed colonial scale of salary than this continual change?—Yes.

495. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You consider the suggested staff would be an improvement on the staff you have in the school?—It would be an improvement.

496. And the work would be lessened for each individual teacher?—It would be a help all round.

497. The sum you are entitled to under the scale is £270; you got more than that: how was it made up?—I got £28 for instructing pupil-teachers. There is a house in connection with the school.

498. Do you consider that the proposed minimum certificates on the scale of staffs is fair and equitable?—I have not considered the matter very much; but since I have come into the room it appears to me that D1 is too high for a 75-to-100 school.

499. Are you in favour of the establishment of side-schools outside a large school like your own?—If you could only prevent an agitation to make them a main school. The only difficulty is that the multiplication of small schools throughout the colony has been so great that if there is a school at the people's back doors they will send their children to that school rather than send them another half a mile to a more central school where they will get a better education.

500. Why was the Ashburton side-school established?—It was established before I went there.

501. Is there any reason why the pupils that attend that school should not attend the main school?—There is no reason why the majority should not attend the main school.

502. Would it not economize work and save the money of the Board?—It would be a distinct advantage to have the one school only.

503. *Mr. Hill.*] You approve of a colonial scheme of salaries: do you also approve of a colonial scale of promotions?—I do not know enough about the various circumstances and the different districts to answer that question. I do not care to see too much centralisation.

504. *Mr. Weston.*] I think you said some of the teachers would be underpaid?—I do not think £80 is really sufficient.

505. What class of school do you think would be underpaid?—I do not think a man or a woman should be put in charge of a school at a salary under £100; and, moreover, looking a little further down, I see a capitation of 12s. carries you on from 35 to 150. I should prefer to see a sliding-scale there.

506. Is there any other objection to the system?—I have not looked through very carefully.

507. How are assistant masters and mistresses provided for in this scale: do you think the allowance to them is reasonable?—I think so.

508. If that be so, granting the defects you have mentioned, you approve of the scale?—Yes, as far as I can see.

509. Do you approve of the several provisions made for staffing schools?—It is more liberal than the present system.

510. Do you approve of it in every respect?—I have not studied it sufficiently to say that it is an advance on the present system.

511. With regard to pupil-teachers, do you experience at Ashburton a difficulty in providing the school with pupil-teachers?—We have had no difficulty so far.

512. Do you think the pupil-teachers' pay should be increased or not?—I think it should; and I think the provision made for paying a little extra to pupil-teachers when they are from home is a good thing.

513. Do you think the absence of male pupil-teachers is attributable to the preponderance of females?—I have had no applications from males for three years.

514. Do you think that time should be given to pupil-teachers for study rather than that they should be kept employed hour after hour during the day?—Decidedly.

515. Do you think the allowance of pupil-teachers as to number is fair?—Yes, as far as I know.

516. What do you think as regards the employment of monitors?—I have not thought the matter out a great deal, but I think there would be a very serious objection.

517. What would be an objection?—My experience of monitors is that they require a great deal of supervision on the part of the master in order to get them to do satisfactory work. If you want clerical work done you can get it done by the upper children without monitors. I do not think it would be wise to employ monitors. In the case of a vacancy for a pupil-teacher in a school where a monitor had been employed the parents of that child would naturally expect it to be appointed to the vacancy, and independent action on the part of the head-teacher would be prevented.

518. You have no monitors in your own school?—No; of course, when a pupil-teacher is away ill we sometimes make use of a Sixth or a Seventh Standard pupil.

518A. *Mr. Hogben.*] You said there ought to be a rise in scale for headmasters of schools over 35: do you not think that schools between 35 and 75 are a very easy type of school to work?—If this scale means anything at all, it should mean promotion as regards the position a man occupies in the school. If a man has a school of 80 it should be better than a school of 70.

519. You do not attach any weight to the fact that help is given to him at 40, and that therefore the salary should increase very slowly?—I do not know enough about that class of school to be able to say that it is easy for the teacher; but the headmaster has the general supervision of the school, and has all the responsibility.

520. Should we give him an increase of 12s.?—I should give him the same; moreover, he has got the mistress to look after, and that in some cases is a responsibility.

521. You have not given me any reason why his salary should be increased faster?—I cannot see why you should have between 35 and 150 a drop of £2 to 12s.

522. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that £80 is too small a minimum to begin with in sole charge of a school?—Yes.

523. What do you think would be a reasonable minimum?—I have not thought the matter out, but I should say £90 or £100, perhaps.

524. I suppose you know pretty well what expense a teacher must incur living in an isolated country district and finding suitable board and lodging?—It is only from hearsay; I have not experienced it myself.

525. With regard to junior assistants, do you think that the minimum fixed—£80 a year—is sufficient?—Yes.

526. You think there ought to be some difference between the minimum salary of what a teacher in a small school in a country district receives and the minimum salary of a junior assistant in one of the large schools?—Decidedly.

527. Have you considered the question of fixing a minimum salary for the larger schools?—I have not considered that.

528. Do you think it advisable that there should be a maximum for all schools?—Of a certain class.

529. Do you think there should be a maximum salary, to be fixed, say, at an attendance of 500, and to remain at that even if the school went up to 1,000?—I have not considered the particular place where such a maximum might begin, but I should think that for a certain class of school it would be an advantage to have a maximum salary.

R. B. RYDER examined.

Mr. Ryder: There are certain points I think ought to be brought before this Commission to show the various disadvantages under which teachers have been labouring for some time. In reference to the colonial scale, I think I may say we have been, under our present system, trying rather to adapt our system of education to the limited amount of funds at our disposal than to establish a system of education and to supply the necessary funds to carry it on. It would be a very great advantage to the colony if, instead of limiting the capitation to a certain sum, we increased it. With a national system of education it is most desirable that we should supply the proper funds to carry on that system. At the present time it appears that the tendency is rather to adapt our system of education to the limited amount of funds. At present the remuneration appears to be barely sufficient to carry on the work. In the different districts there are great differences in salaries, and these are very striking indeed. I have here a paper giving the various salaries in the different districts. In a school with an average of a little over 50 in Auckland the salary is £175 to the master; for a school of 54 in Taranaki, £136; for a school of 54 in Wellington, £225; and there are other instances showing that the salaries in that class of school vary from £136 to £225. In similar schools the mistress gets a salary varying from £61 to £85. Again, taking a school with an average of slightly over 140—141 to 148—we find the salaries vary from £255 in Wellington down to £204 in Hawke's Bay. There are also differences in staff. With regard to larger schools, we find that in one district in a school with an average of 449 the salary for the master is £250. That is in Grey; and for an average of 406 in Wellington the salary is £370. Here we have a contrast in salaries of £250 to £370. The salaries of assistant masters also vary in different schools. For instance, we have a salary of £150 in a school of 451 in Auckland for the first assistant master, and in a school of 406 in Wellington the salary is £220. I am not aware whether house allowance is included or not. These instances will tend to show that the differences in salaries in the various districts are very great indeed, and they afford a sound argument, I hold, in favour of a colonial scale, so that the teachers in the various districts doing the same work, and under somewhat similar conditions, may receive somewhere about the same amount of pay. According to the report for 1900, we find there are a large number of teachers in the colony getting less than £100 per year. For instance, we find that receiving under £100 there were 198 sewing-mistresses, who may practically be excluded, 1,022 pupil-teachers, and 1,023 adult teachers. For the whole colony the total number of adult teachers is 2,592, so that about two-fifths of those are receiving under £100. In this connection

I may say that I believe the salaries are now less than in 1888. The general tendency has been downward. With regard to the salaries paid to teachers, we find that at the present time they are getting in many cases less than artisans. Only the other day the Arbitration Court, in fixing the minimum for bootmakers, I think it was, fixed £2 2s. a week as a minimum; and just a couple of days ago, in the furniture trade, a minimum was fixed of £2. I also notice in one of our daily papers an advertisement for a sexton, a salary of £120, with a free house, being offered. Contrast this with what many of our teachers get. Some of them receive only £65 a year. Out of all our teachers in the colony we have 1,023 out of 2,592 adult teachers getting less than £100. Then, again, if we contrast the primary schools with secondary schools, we find the average salary in the latter, according to the report for 1899, is about £220, with an average of 17 children to each teacher. In our primary schools the average salary is about £93. The teachers have much to complain of in the various reductions. The question has been brought before the Commission; and it is evident that the teachers have suffered very much indeed by these reductions. We are well aware that the Education Boards have been forced into this position, but still it is no less a hardship for the teachers. It seems the funds have not been in hand, and the Boards have had to do something; therefore the salaries have had to suffer. In North Canterbury we had reductions in 1888, 1894, and 1900. I would point out that in a school of 150 in 1888 the salary in North Canterbury was £231 10s.—that is, allowing for pupil-teachers—and now it would be £215 5s. This gives a difference of £16 15s.; and other instances may also be mentioned throughout the colony. It appears that the average is falling very considerably. In 1889 it was £96 10s. 11d., and in 1898 it was £94 9s. 10d., so there has generally been a downward tendency. In regard to staffing, there is also a great variety of methods. We find that for a school of from 50 to 60 some have a master and mistress, and some a master and pupil-teacher. Now, every one must admit there is a great difference between the teaching-power in these cases, and it is only fair to the teachers and children of the colony that a definite system be adopted in that respect. With regard to schools from 141 to 148 we find also varying staffs. The staffing ranges from three adult and two pupil teachers to three adult teachers only. The latter case is in Otago. For a school of from 400 to 406 North Canterbury has five adult and five pupil teachers; Otago, seven adult and one pupil teacher; Wellington, four adult to seven pupil teachers. The staffing admits of far too many pupil-teachers, as in the case of Wellington. Another objection to the staffing at present in force throughout New Zealand is that there are too many pupils to each teacher. The average in the colony, I believe, is far higher than it should be. It is 30·5 for all schools. Another thing I would point out is that it is most desirable that the sum of money intended to pay the instructors of the children should actually go to them, and not be liable to other demands upon it. It has been found in the past that demands have been made upon it. The Boards have actually been compelled to come upon it to carry on their work. I find that for North Canterbury—and this is the only district I have statistics for—for the training of teachers there has been an excess of £6,932 in the last five years, up to 1899; and also for the very necessary work of inspection the Government subsidy appears to be insufficient, so the maintenance funds have to suffer for that. Then, it appears that throughout the colony the sum of £11,955 in excess of the grant has been used for technical education. I am not aware that the money has been devoted to that purpose in North Canterbury, and I think it redounds to the credit of the Board that they have withstood the tide in favour of that. Another point which seems to show that the funds should be, to use a familiar term, "ear-marked" is that the incidental funds in various districts seem to vary very much. In Auckland I find that for 364 schools, with an average attendance of 22,600, the expenditure was £6,736. In North Canterbury, 196 schools, with an average attendance of 16,592, the expenditure was £6,842. In Otago, with 216 schools, with an average attendance of 17,700, the expenditure was £5,494. Thus it appears, with this rate of expenditure, North Canterbury has heavier demands on it than other districts. I think it will be noticed in this connection there are other sufferers besides teachers—viz., the Boards. It appears that these reductions are not willingly undertaken by the Boards, and therefore I think a colonial scale will be a measure of relief to them, provided sufficient funds were provided for the carrying-out of the ordinary work. In regard to the colonial scale itself, I would suggest that the minimum salary should be such as to attract good men and women. If we are to have a thoroughly colonial system it is most desirable that the minimum salary should be sufficient for this; and, further, that the maximum salary, the highest salary ordinarily attainable, should be such as to tempt good men and women to enter the profession in the hopes of reaching it. It is not at all desirable that persons should be led into the profession simply, perhaps, to be removed later on into more congenial spheres. In respect to the different classes of teachers, I hold that a teacher in charge of a small school, where he has to supervise the school and the work of the subordinate teachers, and instruct pupil-teachers, should receive special consideration when compared with assistants in large schools, where the assistant has simply to deal with one class; though I would not urge on any account that the salaries of assistants should be unreasonably reduced. Their work is heavy, and they should receive adequate remuneration; but the point is, I think, the teacher in a country school of from 140 to 150, with several different classes to attend to, should receive more on the average than a first assistant in a large school. Another point is that in our colonial schools more effort should be made to make the salary such that a teacher will not have to look to the State for a pension at the time when his life-work is over. He should receive such a salary that he will be able to provide a competency for himself and those dependent upon him. The teacher's life is very unhealthy. The North Canterbury Board has frequently to entertain applications for sick-leave. In my own school teachers have had to make such applications. The teacher's life being unhealthy, it is the more necessary that some effort should be made to give him a salary to allow of his providing for the time when he can no longer work,

The teachers in country schools should receive some special consideration. There are many things against them. They are removed from the literary and social advantages of the town. The teachers in a country district have not the opportunity of attending college courses and enjoying the companionship of others in their own profession. Besides, they are often in uncongenial surroundings. They are in a district, perhaps, where the people around them can talk of nothing but the crops, sheep, and occasionally politics. At present they have really no hope of getting into town schools. The way is practically barred. I am aware this is no fault of our Board, but the fact remains that they are debarred. If they wish to attend a course of lectures in town they are put to great expense. Even now, though the efforts of the Institute, backed up by the Board, have enabled them to come to town and attend some classes, still there is expense attached to it; besides, they lose their only holiday. Then, as to the payment of salaries, many have suffered through the salaries not being paid promptly; but I think that has already been brought forward. A point not yet adduced is that in country schools teachers have a good deal of hard work owing to the irregularity of the children, and the fact that many of those children have to work before coming to school and afterwards, and naturally this is a very serious drawback. In the Taranaki District it is a very serious matter indeed. In the country they are more at the mercy of the weather and the crops. Another point: the country teacher is practically tied to his school. He has to live in the house and school-grounds, and, in a measure, has to act as caretaker. The teacher in the town schools very often has his house away, and is relieved of the sight of the school and surroundings for a certain time. Then, in the country the teachers have not very suitable means of obtaining higher education for the members of their family if they wish it, or employment. The direction in which a teacher's ideas run would naturally lead him to put some of his children into the learned walks of life, and that is practically impossible. Then, in the country the expense of living is very great indeed. In the country schools head-teachers have all the classes to teach, say, from Standard II. upwards. The classes are varied; but in larger schools the teacher is relieved of a great deal of preparation when he has only one class to teach. In regard to staffing, in smaller schools, where one teacher has to teach several classes, and at the same time supervise the school-work, the number of pupils to each teacher should be as low as possible. There should be fewer pupil-teachers on the whole. A large number of pupil-teachers is a serious weakness to any school. I have had not much experience where there has been a large number of pupil-teachers; but, still, I take it that if, on the whole, the average was one pupil-teacher to five adults the efficiency of the work would be very much increased. If the colonial scale is to be carried out, an effort should be made to make it a thoroughly comprehensive one. Then, as to the question of grading schools, a great trouble teachers have to contend with is the falling-off in attendance. It seems a pity a teacher should have to suffer through no fault of his own. A colonial scale, I think, would do much good if provision could be made in it for a regular method of promotion, and possibly allowing of exchanging teachers on some well-defined basis. It is felt to be a very great hardship by teachers who have been teaching for years amongst the wilds to find that their juniors are appointed to schools over their heads. In my own case I have had a junior appointed to a school over my head. He was a very able teacher, still he was my junior; and others have suffered in the same way. I should think that a teacher's ability rather than his certificate should qualify him for a school. By ability I mean his teaching ability, and not merely his literary qualifications. An effort should be made to allow teachers to come into the towns by means of promotion or exchange, or by any other facilities, such as allowing them means and convenience to pass through the college course of lectures, so that they may improve their status.

530. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] What is the average number of pupils intrusted to each teacher?—The number varies considerably, but in a school where a teacher has several classes to deal with he cannot instruct as many children as if he had a single class. Taken on the average, I should say the teacher could teach properly up to perhaps 30.

531. Do you believe in equal pay for equal work?—The phrase "equal pay for equal work" involves a fallacy, which I would illustrate in this way: We might have a picture of an animal painted by Landseer, and another artist might paint the same picture. Now, one who knew nothing about art would think they were of equal merit, but an artist could tell the difference between them. He would tell you that Landseer's work was superior to the others.

532. What is your opinion with reference to the method proposed by the Education Board in regard to staff?—I have not had much experience, so could not say.

533. What do you consider should be the maximum and minimum salaries for teachers?—Teachers should have a salary sufficient to provide for their old age. I would not make a maximum—that is, I would not say that a teacher should not go beyond a certain sum. I would say, at the very lowest he should get £100—I should be inclined to say £150 should be the minimum; and I should like to see a prospect of £500 or £600 a year for those at the head of the profession. The expenditure would be considerable; but the advantages would be so great in drawing really good men and women into the profession that the colony would be well repaid.

534. You were saying that country teachers were not able to get their children to the towns to work: do not you think that, as the agricultural and mining industries are undoubtedly the backbone industries of the colony, they have a splendid opportunity of finding employment for some of their children in the country?—In country districts competition is keen, and very often the children of teachers, being trained on different lines from those of the settlers, are rather at a disadvantage when seeking employment of the kind you mention.

535. How would you promote teachers?—I have an idea that some well-defined plan such as this might be followed: that a teacher, before being appointed to a responsible assistantship in town schools, should pass, perhaps, a couple of years in a small school in the country, and should be regularly promoted from grade to grade of schools.

536. If a vacancy should occur in the town, would you put in the hands of the Board the power to promote a teacher well qualified from a country district?—Yes, I think so. Taking the present conditions as they stand, I think it would be well for the Board to have this power in their hands. They would do their best in the interests of all concerned.

537. The difficulty is to carry it out?—The question is so wide you can hardly in such a limited time make a suggestion to cover it.

538. *Mr. Hill.*] Are you aware that this Commission is called upon to construct a scale on a £3 8s. 9d. basis?—No, sir, I am not.

539. Do you think it possible to construct such a scale as you suggest on such a basis?—No, sir.

540. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] What is the average attendance in your school?—About 147.

541. According to our last report, the average attendance was 130, and the salary £210: how would the proposed scale of salaries affect you?—There would be an increase of £2.

542. According to the returns in 1899, your salary was £227 14s.: your school has fallen in attendance until last year?—Yes.

543. Nevertheless it cost a good deal more for salaries with an attendance of 137 than with the attendance of 149. For 1899 the cost of salaries in your school was £394 14s., but in 1900, with an average attendance of 137, it only cost £400 10s., owing to the promotion of a pupil-teacher and the substitution of an assistant. Under the proposed scale you will have two assistant female teachers in your school, one at £90 and one at £80?—That is, taking the mistress of the infant department as an assistant Then, I should have my present staff—master, assistant mistress, second assistant mistress, and one pupil-teacher. But there are other points to be noticed in this. The salary of the mistress as it stands there is only £90, but at present my mistress is getting £103.

544. Then, there is another assistant mistress at £67 10s.: she will get an increase of £12 10s.?—Yes, but there would be objection to the reduction.

545. Do you know of any schools of the same size as this school which will be injuriously affected by the proposed scale?—In all our schools of this size the salary of the chief mistress of the school will be reduced by £13. That, of course, will affect the school.

546. It will not be affected if the second mistress will have her salary increased to the same extent?—I can hardly agree with that. Then, there is another point. In many schools the teacher will suffer on account of the certificate.

547. You are not in favour of making reductions in salary on account of holding a low certificate?—I think it is an utterly wrong principle.

548. *Mr. Weston.*] Apart from the objections you have just raised to the scale, are there any other difficulties you can point out to us?—I might point out one thing. Taking a school of 150, the master gets £219. He very often has 160 children to deal with, pupil-teachers to instruct, and has to supervise junior teachers. The first assistant in a large school gets £250, and the first assistant in a school of 570, £220. Then, an assistant in a school of 570 to 600 often obtains a position with a lower certificate, but in a school of 150 a D1 certificate is necessary.

549. Can you tell us if, in your opinion, the lady teachers of this colony will be properly provided for?—That is a wide question. It seems to me that a minimum of £80 is in some cases, at all events, moderate enough. I can hardly give a definite opinion.

550. Have you considered the position of the first and second assistant masters on this scale?—I notice that with regard to the salaries of the first and second assistant masters in some of the schools there is a difference of £70, and such a difference is very great indeed. One gets £250 and the other £180. I think the difference is too great, considering the position of the first and second assistant masters do not differ so very materially. Not that I think £250 too much for the first assistant master. Another point: In certain schools, a school of 176, the mistress is to get £100. In a school of 226 the mistress is to get £105, an increase of £5 for 50 pupils. In a school of 391 the mistress is to get £130, and in a school of 421 a salary of £140. I wish to point out that the increase in one case for 50 pupils is £5, and in the other case, for an increase of 30 pupils, it is £10. I think this is unjust.

551. I understand you to mean that this proposed scale requires very careful revision?—Yes.

552. And that you believe the minimum wage of male teachers should be £150: what about the minimum wage for lady teachers?—I said I should feel inclined to say about £150, but I thought no lower than £100, and for ladies I should feel inclined to put somewhere near the same figures, provided the work is equal.

553. You believe in equal pay for equal work?—I have no objection at all. The question is how to fix that scale of equality.

554. Supposing the average attendance, in order to determine the salary of the master, were taken over a lengthened period, such as a year or two years, would not that minimise the effect of a good many things you call attention to?—You are speaking, sir, of what is known as the working-average, I should think. That certainly would smooth the way a little, although even then it would practically spread out into a year what is now put into one quarter.

555. If a school has a roll-number of 50, you, generally speaking, have an average attendance of 40 or a little over. If, therefore, you pay on the roll-number, the salary for a school of 50 will be, approximately, such as we allow an average attendance of 40; so you simply substitute another scale corresponding to the numbers on the roll instead of the numbers of the average attendance. Do you think it would be fairer to take the roll-number than it would be to take the average attendance to measure the size of the school?—The roll-number varies considerably, and I think payment on the roll-number would present considerable difficulty. For instance, when the names of children leaving the schools should be struck off, the teachers would be urged to keep the names on, and so keep up the status of the school. It would present difficulties in that way.

556. You agree, I suppose, that the salaries, that of the headmaster particularly, must depend on the number of pupils he has to teach?—Generally so.

557. His salary should increase as the size of the school increases?—Yes.

558. What is the best test of the size of the school—the average attendance or the roll-number?—It is difficult to say. If strictly purged, the roll-number would be the best.

559. The first assistant in a large school is paid more than a country schoolmaster of a school of a certain size: does the first assistant get house allowance in this district?—No.

560. Does the schoolmaster of a small school get a house?—It depends on what you call a house. I should call it a place to live in.

561. You say the salary of the first assistant differs too much from that of the second assistant: does not the first assistant have a good deal of work of supervision to do in a large school?—I am not aware of it.

562. Are you not aware that in some cases the first assistant looks, to a very large extent, after drawing, and other subjects like that?—I was not aware of it; but, even so, it would take him away from other duties, and lighten his work.

563. Do you think supervision is lighter work than the doing of the work—that is, being supervised?—Generally so.

564. Do you not think, if the headmaster is away, the second master has to act as his deputy?—I should think that very reasonable.

565. Do not you think he ought to be better paid for the skill that makes him fit to be looked upon as a deputy headmaster?—I do not. The cases are so few when the headmaster is away, it is hardly necessary to consider that point. Besides, in a small school like my own the mistress might have to take charge.

566. *The Chairman.*] Do you think the profession of teaching, on the whole, is suffering because teachers are underpaid?—I think it is, especially owing to the fact that we have a difficulty in obtaining suitable pupil-teachers. A short time ago, in North Canterbury, a very able young member of the profession left to take a post in the Treasury Department, and I have heard of similar cases.

567. Are the particular class of teachers you have much underpaid—more than the others?—In North Canterbury, in schools similar to mine, the second mistress is very much underpaid; her salary is £67 10s.

568. Do you find that country schools of moderate size—say, about 30 to 40 in average attendance—when a vacancy occurs, attract the city teachers?—As far as I am aware, there is no desire on the part of city teachers to enter such positions as those—the very reverse. It is a rare thing for a teacher to leave a large school in the city to take charge of a country school.

569. Do you think, if a vacancy arose in a city school, you would have any difficulty in finding country teachers to jump into it?—The difficulty would be to keep them out.

570. According to that, you think the city has a monopoly of the prizes, and not the country?—Yes. I would prefer to be a city teacher. I would take the same salary as I am getting now, without the house allowance, to get a situation in the city.

571. What is your opinion about the relative positions of the headmaster in a large school and his assistants: do you think, under this proposed scale, the assistants are fairly paid in proportion to the headmaster?—Taken generally, I should say the payment was fair.

572. Do you think it reasonable that a headmaster should have £50 in the city for house allowance, and the first and second assistant should receive no consideration?—I think it is rather unjust.

573. I presume the conclusion you have arrived at is this: that the country teachers are inadequately paid, and their salaries should be raised in order to make the schools more attractive for a more efficient class of teachers?—Yes; and so that the children of the settlers in the country should, with an increased and properly-paid staff, receive the same advantages as the children of the artisans in the city.

574. *Mr. Weston.*] You said the headmaster had a house; therefore the first and second assistants should either have a house or house allowance. If that be so, then, in justice, all teachers should be considered in the question of house allowance?—That would be the conclusion to arrive at.

575. That would materially enhance the total cost of our district schools?—My intention was to indicate that the amount paid, £50, was rather heavy. I was not advocating house allowance generally.

576. *Mr. Stewart.*] You told us whenever there were appointments in the country they were not sought after by town teachers?—As a rule, I think they are not, because the inducements given are not sufficient. The teacher in town has all the advantages of town-life, the social and other advantages. Then, the town teacher has not the worry that has to be put up with in country schools.

577. Do I understand you to say that the reason they do not apply for country schools is not a question of money, but the social advantages and opportunities of town-life?—I understood your question referred to salaries.

578. You said that the general circumstances and the social life and advantages of town-life operated in this direction: do you now mean it is a question of salary between the two?—A salary of, say, £175 in the country might possibly attract a teacher with a salary of £130 in the town, with possibly a house in the country.

579. Is it, then, within your knowledge that in many cases it is not so much a question of salary between town and country as a particular liking for a town-life?—I would not like to say that; but it is the gain of the surrounding circumstances of town-life, the various advantages, such as being able to get proper tuition for higher certificates, and social intercourse with people of similar standing.

L. Watson examined.

Mr. Watson: I represent a large class of country teachers, and I shall not more than touch upon some of the questions that have been brought up by other country teachers. I may say at the outset that all the teachers, with, I think, few exceptions, in the North Canterbury District hail with delight the prospect of a colonial scale of salaries. They have looked for a number of years with a kind of horror at the recurring reductions which are made from time to time, and only this morning, on looking through the paper, we find that our own Board has gone back to the extent of £2,000 for this last year; and were it not for the prospect of a colonial scale we would still have the feeling of uncertainty whether our salaries will not be reduced next year, because it would take more than two years with £900 a year to make up that £2,000. As has already been said, we feel that a colonial scale would be a fixity. In the first page of the colonial scale it mentions that efforts would be made to keep good teachers in the profession. In order to do that there should be attractive salaries. Not only that, but I think there should be some system of promotion. Some of the teachers are out in districts far removed from populous centres, and it seems hopeless for them to get a change. Our own Board has tried to meet the wishes of the teachers in making some promotions, but it fails very materially. I could point out cases in which teachers have been applying for vacancies for the last nine or ten years, and still they have the same school. I think there should be some system by which teachers could get out of the positions they hold when those positions cease to be attractive. This would prevent a man being fossilised. He would take a greater interest in the profession, and would in consequence become a better teacher. There might, perhaps, be a case where things have gone a little awry between the teacher and the parents of the children, and it would be in the interest of the school, as well as his own interest, if he got another position. He would be again interested in the profession, but if left where he is there is so much friction that he ceases to be useful, and the Board, in the interests of education, has nothing to do but to dispense with his services. Therefore I think some provision should be made for transferring teachers from one school to another. Then, in reference to falling attendance, it sometimes happens that a teacher's services are dispensed with on that account. According to the scale, they are no longer required in their particular school. Now, when a teacher's services are dispensed with on that account he should not have to seek another appointment: he should have one given to him. I noticed when the scale went up from 36 to 41 nine or ten teachers were dismissed, and some of them found very great difficulty in finding other positions. A case occurs to me at the present time, where a teacher was dismissed owing to the school being closed, and she is out of a position at the present time. Then, the salaries should not depend so much upon the average attendance as they do. I think a value should be put on a teacher's qualifications, and should his qualifications not be used to the full, if the employing body does not realise it is getting full work for the money, or as much as he can give, it should place him where they do get the full value. Teachers are penalised on account of falling attendance, and they often find themselves receiving lower salaries as they advance in years and experience. I can quote a case where, twelve months ago, the roll-number was 103; the average attendance for the September quarter 1899 was 82. The roll-number for this March quarter was 50; average attendance, 37·7. This was owing to a private school having been started in the district, and that teacher is penalised on that account to about £36 10s. As to certificates, I do not think any penalty should be attached to a teacher holding a school where his certificate is lower than that set against that school. Teachers should be appointed to schools on the strength of their qualifications to work those schools. The present system of classification is too complex. There should be a simpler system, by which both scholarship and qualifications for primary-school work would be encouraged. Many dismissals have taken place during the last few years under our Board. I could mention a teacher with an M.A. degree, and yet under this scale that teacher with an M.A. degree would get a higher salary, though he might not be able to do as good work as a man with a D certificate. Then, the D certificate is got in two ways. It does not always represent persons of equal qualifications. Teachers do not require the fear of a penalty to make them seek higher certificates. In seeking to hold their positions they must become more efficient. I do not think we need to penalise a teacher because his certificate is low in order to spur him up. His position is sufficiently precarious to make him work hard in this direction. Teachers in single-handed schools should have special consideration, and the women in these schools should have salaries equal to those of men. To get sufficient teachers to leave the centres of population, the companionship of their fellow-students, and all the advantages of town-life, they should have a salary offered them to induce them to give their very best in these country schools. It is undesirable that inexperienced teachers should go into new settlements. When a teacher leaves the normal school he should be made an assistant in a large school, and after two or three years' experience in that respect there should be a sufficient inducement offered him to go to the country. The small salary offered in these schools often means a less efficient teacher, and then the settlers suffer. The settlers, besides the hardships incidental to pioneer work, should not have the hardship of their children not being as well taught as they should be. If the salaries of single-handed schools were the same for both males and females, it would probably happen that the positions would be taken by first-class female teachers instead of by second-class male teachers, and the schools would reap the benefit. In the colonial scale of salaries it should be made less difficult to get a living-wage and easier to get a salary of £200, and to that end, if the capitation were made 15s. instead of 12s., it would bring the salary up to £180 for 75, instead of £174, as at present; and allowing it to be 12s. after that would bring it up to £195 for a school of 100. There is another matter—that of conveying children to school. As an example, I noticed, coming to town this morning, two schools very close to the railway-line, and the children from one or both of these could be taken to a third on the same line, and thus there would be greater efficiency and less expense. If they could be conveyed in that way it would be a great advantage.

580. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—I was four years pupil-teacher at the Leeston School, a year at the Normal School, three years at the Rotherham School, where the average was from 25 to 33; nine years at the Woodside School, average from 65 down to 40; and two years at the Kirwee School. I have had considerable experience, therefore, as pupil-teacher and headmaster in the smaller schools in North Canterbury.

581. Have you considered the staff in this suggested scale of salaries?—I have in the class of schools like my own, with an attendance of not more than 100.

582. Do you think the average woman is capable of teaching as large a school as a man?—No, I do not.

583. What is the limit you would place, as far as the average attendance is concerned, upon a school to which a woman might be appointed?—I think a woman could take charge of a school up to 35 scholars without much difficulty.

584. Do you think a man is capable of doing more than a woman: what is the limit you would place for a man to have sole charge of?—I think a man is quite able to do the work of a school of 40 or 41.

585. Have you carefully gone into the salaries attached to this class of school in the suggested scale?—Yes.

586. Do you approve of certain grades of school, say from 20 to 25, 25 to 30, carrying a fixed salary, or would you prefer the increase per unit rather than graded schools carrying fixed salaries?—I would prefer the graded school carrying the fixed salary, but I would not have the grades very large. The grades here are too large, say 35 to 75.

587. Did you notice the salary fixed for the infant mistress, in a medium school of, say, 75 to 100?—Yes.

588. In the case of a graded school, 75 to 100, what is the salary attached to that position?—£85.

589. Do you consider that a sufficient salary for a woman who will probably have charge of the preparatory classes and Standards I. and II.—No, I do not.

590. Have you compared the salary of the women in the next grade of schools, 100 to 150? The suggested salary here is £90. Do you consider that a sufficiently large salary for a woman in that position?—Not for 150 pupils.

591. *Mr Stewart.*] Did you agree with the evidence given this morning in regard to salaries being paid direct?—Yes.

592. Your Board is quite willing to pay the salaries to you direct if the individual Committees do not object to that?—Yes.

593. Is there any provision in the Act or statute which gives the Committee a right to object in that way?—No.

594. With regard to incidentals in your district, do you find your own Committee has not a sufficient sum of money for its work?—I think so. They have a very substantial credit balance. Next year they may have considerably less, because there may be something required which is not required this year.

595. What are the main inducements to apply for a town position?—The main inducements are the opportunities for getting higher certificates. Speaking for myself, I should like to come into town only for that. It is not a question of money; I should not come into town solely on account of a higher salary.

596. *Mr. Luke.*] Are there no means of getting instruction or coaching for higher degrees in the country where you live, so that the young teachers might get better certificates?—There is no opportunity in the country unless you make some arrangement with a teacher living not far off, who might have a degree higher than the one you possess.

597. The reason I asked this was that some of the teachers in outlying districts have obtained their B.A. degree, and next year their M.A., by a system of tuition by correspondence and their own exertions.

598. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] What is the average attendance at your school?—41.

599. What salary do you receive?—About £140 15s.

600. According to the proposed scale, you would get £153 12s.; the mistress at present getting £68 will get £80—an increase of £12—and the increase to your salary will be £13 12s.?—Yes.

601. Do you consider the adoption of the proposed scale of salaries will tend to increase the salaries of the teachers in schools similarly situated to the one you have?—Yes, I think so.

602. Seeing there are two-thirds of the total number of schools in the colony having an average attendance of less than 50, would you consider these smaller schools should receive every consideration at the hands of the Commission, Education Boards, and the department?—Yes; but I do not think the lower schools should receive benefit at the expense of the higher.

603. *Mr. Hill.*] Would you like to see a colonial scale of promotion established?—At the present time we have a provincial or a parochial system, and I think no provincial scale, however good it may be, is sufficiently large to do justice to the teachers in it.

604. Do you agree with the present mode of classifying teachers in reference to certificates?—I think that all certificates should be literary—A, B, C, D, and E, but that the figure should always represent the same qualification in whatever class it belongs to. It should represent the same in A1 as in E1. The number should be the same throughout.

605. Do you think it should be made as difficult for a man with an academic status to obtain a certificate as it is for a teacher to obtain a degree?—Yes.

606. You stated just now that a teacher should be removed to a district where all his qualities would be utilised. Are you aware how much effective force is lost by teachers being placed in districts where they have not sufficient children to teach?—If a teacher is capable of teaching 80 children one month and only has 50 next month, I think there would be an effective force of teaching 30 children lost.

607. Are you not aware there are a large number of schools where the attendance is below 20? What do you propose to do with those teachers? You say the teachers should be removed to districts where their whole services could be utilised. These teachers are capable of teaching more than 20 children. How do you propose to utilise their services?—I should take the teacher away and put him to a school he was fitted for.

608. What class of teacher would you put to take charge of those schools below 20?—I should put a woman, and I would have a sufficient salary for schools below 20 to induce a teacher to go there for experience.

609. Would you put a man or a woman to such a school?—In many cases I would put a woman; in some cases a man. I should put a man in some cases, because the circumstances might make it very difficult for a woman to get on. A woman has greater hardships to put up with in outlying districts than a man has. A man can rough it better than a woman, and he can take lodgings where it would not be nice for a woman to take lodgings.

610. Would you give a man a larger salary than a woman?—I would give the man the same salary as a woman in a single-handed school.

611. What would you consider as the limit that a woman could manage unaided?—I should think up to 35. After that, I would substitute a man.

612. What do you think is the limit of a man's capacity in a school unaided?—I should think about 40 children.

613. Do you think he could teach 45?—Sometimes he has had to teach 60.

614. Suppose a salary were offered you of £140 a year to teach 40 children, and one at £160 a year to teach 45 to 50, which would you prefer?—I would take £140 a year and have to work less.

615. *Mr. Weston.*] I believe the teachers as a body do not agree to payment on the average attendance?—The teachers object. The average attendance is not equitable.

616. Have the teachers been able to devise a substitute for that?—No.

617. What would you suggest?—I should suggest, to equalise matters, to take an estimate between the average roll-number and the average attendance.

618. Have you read the proposed colonial scale?—Yes.

619. With the exceptions you have already dealt with, are you able to tell us whether you approve or disapprove of the scale as a whole?—There are one or two more things I disapprove of. One is, salary being taken away from a man to pay some one else—the £10 being taken away from the master to pay a sewing-mistress. I also disapprove of the conditions of giving the £10 to the master's wife. It comes out of the master's pocket, and I do not think the master's wife should have to go into the school to devote her afternoon a week for the sole reason to get hold of that £10. If it is right for the master to pay £10, he should pay it to the woman best fitted to teach sewing in that school.

620. In the average schools of 250 to 600, do you think the lady teachers get sufficient salary?—I have not studied this scheme particularly, except in the first part of it, from 14 to 250. I have not formed any opinion beyond that.

621. You are unable, then, to express an opinion on the scale?—I am able to express an opinion in regard to schools such as my own. Beyond that I have no opinion.

622. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you object to the principle of deductions for lower certificates?—Yes.

623. It is really not essential to this scheme. The deductions in the colony amount to about £10,000. How do you propose to make that up if you do not take it off the certificates: this uses up all the money?—I certainly would not make any deductions at all. I do not see how any deduction can be made on salaries up to £200, and I do not think it would be at all just or equitable. The remedy would be to reduce all the salaries proportionately.

624. *The Chairman.*] What do you think should be a sufficient minimum salary for a teacher in charge of a small school?—Circumstances alter cases, but, as a general thing, I do not think any teacher should get less than £100 in a small school, especially if that school be beyond twenty miles from a leading centre.

625. As the result of your experience, do you consider teachers in those small isolated schools in the country are inadequately paid?—I do.

626. Is that, in your opinion, the reason why it is easy to find abundant applications for better salaried teachers in large centres, but it is very difficult to find efficient teachers for the country districts?—Yes.

627. You think, up to a certain number, male and female teachers are equally adapted for the charge of schools?—Yes.

628. I presume if the salaries in those small schools were increased there would be applications from both male and female teachers?—Yes.

629. I think I understood you to say that you recognised the fact that in many cases the conditions and surroundings were of such a character that it would be extremely inadvisable for a female to be sent to some of those schools?—Yes; I have heard of cases where it is so.

Mr. Theophilus Cooper, examined.

Mr. Cooper: I have been a member of the Education Board in Auckland, up to three or four months ago, for seventeen or eighteen years, and I wish to say that I think the suggestion for a colonial scale of salaries is one that ought to be carried out. I have found, in our experience in the education district, that the teachers are kept in a continual state of unrest, not knowing what their salaries might be the next year, because of the continual changes going on in the Board; and, therefore, I think a colonial scale would do away with a great deal of this. During my experience as a member of the Board I proposed one scale, and I think every other member during the last seventeen years proposed a scale of salary, with the result that while I was a member of the Board

five or six different scales of salary were adopted. I believe within the last month the Auckland Education Board have brought into force another scale. I have thought, with Mr. Luke, a colleague of mine upon the Board, that it was unfair to the teachers to have this state of unrest. If a universal scale is adopted, that power is taken away from the Board, and I do not think the Education Board in any district should have the power to fix the scale of salaries for another reason—namely, that no two scales of salary throughout the colony agree. We find some teachers are paid less in Auckland than in Canterbury, and some are paid less in Otago than in Canterbury. Some are paid more in Otago than in Auckland, and some are paid less, with the same qualifications and the same number in the school. In my opinion the teaching profession is the highest profession that either man or woman can enter. I do not think this has been sufficiently considered. The tendency of these continual alterations in the scale of salaries has been to send out of the profession men and women who would have been very excellent teachers. They have gone into other professions. In reference to staffing schools, there has not been a consistent staffing—there has not been a similar system of staffing in one district to another district. The Boards themselves are not consistent in the staffing of schools under their own jurisdiction. We have been inconsistent in Auckland. The staffing also should be taken from the jurisdiction of the Board. I think it would greatly improve the condition of the teachers. I do not pretend to express any expert opinion upon the scale proposed, but there are two matters which strike me as being very much preferable to the present condition of affairs: first, there is a more systematic and consistent gradation shown for the increase in salaries than, at any rate, we have in our Board; and the second is that, without doing any injury to the teachers in the higher schools, this scheme seems to me to point in the direction of doing justice to teachers in the schools with a fewer number of children. I may say that Auckland is a peculiar district in regard to this. Speaking from memory, we have 350 schools. The district runs from the North Cape to Mokau, and the result is there are a very large number of the small schools under 50, many of them are under 25, and there are a considerable number between 50 and 100, running to 150 to 200 in some districts; but the result of keeping these salaries down as low in some cases as £75 and £80 a year is that it is not fair to expect teachers with any experience to go into these schools. I think the effect of this scale, raising, as far as I understand it, the salaries of those teachers in the small schools to something like a living-wage, is a very great advance over the present system, and I should be glad to see it adopted. There is another feature in the scheme which, so far as I can see, is advantageous, and that is the increasing of the salaries of assistant teachers. There is a very large responsibility put upon these assistant teachers. As the school gets larger the first assistant has a higher responsibility. For large schools it has always seemed to me an injustice to find that the first assistant teacher is, under our Board at any rate, paid something less than half the salary of the headmaster. The first assistant is the mate of the ship, and is supposed to be competent to take charge of the school, and to do so in the absence of the headmaster. I notice this scale tends to raise the salary of the assistant teachers. Then there is another point I approve of—it tends to raise the salary of the female teachers. As a matter of strict justice (it would be impossible to carry it out in practice), where a lady teacher does equal work with a male teacher, and has equal qualifications, in strict justice she ought to get equal pay. Unfortunately, I suppose the finances of the colony will not stand that. Up to a certain point they should be placed upon an equality as far as possible. The female teacher who has charge of a school of 50 children should, in my opinion, receive the same salary as the male teacher in charge of the same class. She has to do the same work, and she has the same responsibility, and has to be as efficient; therefore she ought to receive the same pay. Then, as to the lower standards, I think the female teachers are very much better qualified to teach younger children than male teachers, and I think they certainly ought to be placed upon the same footing as far as pay is concerned. The State gets the same value, and in many instances higher value from the lady teachers than from the male teachers. I see the scale is changed in that direction also. I have always thought it very hard indeed to send a young girl, who has perhaps only taken her certificate, into some country district where the conditions are severe enough as regards men and infinitely worse as regards girls. I have an intimate knowledge of the North, and there are places in the North to which we have sent lady teachers that I certainly would not send my own daughter to. These, I think, are the principal matters I wish to refer to. House allowance is a very important question as far as the North is concerned. I think we have only about half of the school districts in the North with houses attached to them. Many of the country districts certainly have. I see that this scale provides for some such suggestion of house allowance, but it is obvious that a teacher placed in charge of a school of 150 children, with a fixed salary and a house, is in a better position than a teacher placed in charge of a school of a similar number without a house. I should like to see some means adopted to enable the Boards to erect houses in those school districts where no houses are now provided. Probably a suggestion might be made that the Government should provide sufficient allowance for this. I wish to express my unqualified approval of the step taken by the department on the principal points: that is, the colonial scale of salaries, taking away from the Boards the right to interfere with the salaries of the staff, also the proposed scale of staffing, which certainly is a step in the right direction and one which has been imperatively called for. I should like to see the inspection of the schools also removed from the control of the Boards. I should like to see a colonial system of inspection under which the Inspectors are changed from one district to another. In our district, during my experience, we have sat as Boards of inquiry upon the conduct of Inspectors, upon schoolmasters, and Committees. I have known members of the Board who considered they were more competent to examine and to check the examination-papers than the examiner appointed by the Board. I have known members of the Board who considered, because they themselves earned £150 or £200 a year, that schoolmasters in charge of schools should be cut

down to that sum, and such members may not have had any sufficient knowledge of the conditions attaching to or the difficulties of the schoolmaster's or mistress's life; and, with all the desire they have to do what is just and right, they often seek to take a wrong step, and to do an injustice to school-teachers who happen to be under their Board's control. I think if this scale is adopted, and the question of staffing schools and payment of salaries were taken away from the Boards, it will be out of the power of any Board to harass the teaching profession by continuing the state of unrest and uncertainty I have before referred to. In my opinion, the teaching profession is the highest and noblest that any man or woman can engage in. Taking it as an average, it is one of the worst paid in the colony. We do not consider sufficiently the fact that the future of our children is practically intrusted to the schoolmaster and schoolmistress. In order that they may be properly educated, it is essential we should have men and women of high standing, culture, and of the highest character, and anything which tends to degrade the school and schoolmaster tends to degrade our own children and spoil their future. I think we should pay the schoolmaster and mistress high salaries, if not the highest of any official professions in the colony. We cannot do that, but we can largely increase the emoluments in a logical way, and we can take away from the Boards of Education that power which they possess of continually harassing and worrying teachers in connection with the reduction of salaries.

630. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you consider the periodical introduction and adoption of salary scales by the Board is inimical to the interests and welfare of the teachers?—The teacher does not know whether he is going to get the same salary the next quarter or not. He is in a state of uncertainty.

631. You had handed to you the latest exhibit we have from the Board of Education of Auckland. In your opinion, is it not impolitic for that Board to attempt to draw up a salary scale while we are considering this question?—Not only impolitic, but it is not at all the thing to do. The result of their proposed scale, as far as I can see, is to reduce many salaries and to keep many at a lower amount. There are a few additions, but it is in the direction in which the Board has acted on more than one occasion: the bringing down, as far as they can, the salaries of some teachers.

Mr. Luke: I knew nothing about it. It was evidently passed in a very great hurry. I was at their last meeting, and no mention was made of it.

Mr. Cooper: I do not wish to make any remarks about this last scale, as I have not had sufficient time to study it; but it only accentuates the position I have referred to just now—the continual state of unrest which has been existing in Auckland for the last fifteen years.

632. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you aware that in 1899, out of 1,640 schools in New Zealand, 451 had an average attendance of under 20 pupils?—Yes, I think it was something like that.

633. Auckland has 100 of these small schools: in your opinion, is the number more than is really necessary?—Yes, it was so. There are some districts in Auckland in which, in one or two instances, we closed up one school because there were too many schools there. In one case in particular there were three small schools within a radius of three miles. The result was two of these schools were closed up and, instead of having three small schools, they had one good school.

634. Do you favour the system of conveying children either by road or rail, where it is possible, to a central school of fair size, rather than have several small schools? Do you think that system is in the interests of true education?—I think it is. Of course, you have to consider the district, and the distance the children have to go. I think where a number of children are carried from one place to another a teacher should be in charge of them. I think, in the interests of education, these small schools should, where practicable, be closed.

635. You think, then, that in a school of 50 or more children the education given is more efficient than in smaller schools?—It must be so.

636. And probably more economical?—Yes; we make the town schools pay for our country schools.

637. You think if children are conveyed, particularly in winter time, to central schools, rather than to be allowed to walk any considerable distance, it would be to the advantage of the children as far as health is concerned?—I think so—that is, where there is a railway. It is far better for them to come three miles in a closed train that walk in the wet road a mile.

638. *Mr. Stewart.*] Referring to the Auckland schools, do you think it would have a bad effect on the teaching profession if the prizes were limited?—Certainly it would. Who is going to enter the teaching profession if his salary is limited to £350 a year? Taking the Auckland schools, I think they, under the last scale, have reduced the highest salary to something like £350 without house. I say that a man who is expected to take charge of a school of 700 boys is entitled to receive a salary adequate to his requirements. A man to take charge of a school like that must have attainments beyond the average, and to attract that class of teacher there must be something he can look forward to; and in order that a teacher in a large school may keep up his position, and maintain the respect of children and parents, he should have more than is barely sufficient to keep himself and his family

639. During the time you were a member of the Auckland Board, did the Board find any difficulty in getting male pupil-teachers?—Oh, yes; we could not get male, but could get many female, pupil-teachers. I would not like to say the proportion, but, at any rate, we have had great difficulty in inducing young men to enter the profession.

640. Do you think the continual change in the scale going on in Auckland for the last fifteen years has had any effect, or kept parents from allowing their boys to enter the profession?—I think so. Of course, many go in because they think the teaching profession is a reputable one.

641. Do you think it wise to put the profession on such a footing that boys and girls enter it merely as a stepping-stone to something better?—No.

642. *Mr. Luke.*] In reference to half-time schools: half-time teaching for these small schools has been in operation in the Auckland Education District?—That is so. The system of half-time

has been worked out in different ways, week and week about, and three days and two days. Half of them were three and two, and the other half three and three. In country districts where there are 7 or 8 children in one district, and 9 or 10 in another, you cannot have a full-time school in either district. If you did not have the half-time school, then the children would probably be uneducated altogether.

643. The average of the two schools is added together in fixing the salary of the teacher. Supposing one school has 12 and one has 13, he has an average of 25?—Yes; and in teaching six days a week he has an extra salary.

644. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you find that a number of the best teachers in the employment of the Board are leaving for other positions on account of the low salaries?—I have known many to do so. Unfortunately, when a teacher gets on in years, forty-five to fifty, he is not usually well fitted for any other work.

645. Do you support the scheme of superannuation or retiring-allowance for those teachers who grow old in the service and have not had an opportunity of providing for old age?—That is a matter which I think Parliament would have to deal with. It is a very difficult question to answer. The funds at the disposal of the Boards are not sufficient to enable them to set apart a nucleus for a pension scheme. I think the salaries paid to teachers should be sufficient to enable them to provide for their old age.

646. You mentioned that the Board, in drawing up a scale of salaries, in the last few years had a tendency rather to reduce than increase the salaries: is not that due to the decrease on the average attendance in the different schools in the district?—Well, it is not so in Auckland; the average has increased there.

647. Do you not think the decrease which took place a short time ago will be only temporary—that before long an increase of pupils will again set in when the children of this generation, as it were, have arrived at school age?—In the North there is a fair increase of population. I was in Dunedin a little while ago, and I was informed that, although the population had increased in the number of adults, still the attendance at the schools had decreased. I doubt very much whether, under our present conditions, as people think and act at the present time, there is very likely to be any considerable increase in the attendance at the schools, as the birth-rate seems to be seriously declining.

648. Do you consider there are too many pupil-teachers in the employment of the Board?—We have tried to meet that in Auckland with but little success. We have more pupil-teachers now than other teachers. We have actually more pupil-teachers in our employment than all the other teachers combined.

649. In order to get over the difficulty, and supply a number of assistant teachers to take the place of pupil-teachers, would you propose that training-colleges be established in the larger centres, and that assistance be given to country teachers to attend the college lectures?—Yes. In our district we have no training-college. We had one up to thirteen years ago, but now there are absolutely no means for a boy or girl to be trained as a teacher except by placing him or her in some school, and requiring the headmaster to give instruction after school hours. I do not think it is fair to the headmaster. He gets nothing for them. He has had all the trouble and the worry of the day, and should not have to take a class of pupil-teachers afterwards for training. Besides, it is not, in my opinion, efficient training. I do not say it is not as efficient as the masters can give, but it is not efficient training in my opinion. In order to train a teacher, he or she should be placed in a training-college. You want practical instruction.

650. Would you favour the system of enabling country scholars to complete their education in the universities, free of cost to themselves, by the institution of exhibitions and scholarships on a more liberal scale?—I think that these secondary schools and universities ought to be used as far as possible for the benefit of the children in the primary schools, and not for the assistance of those parents who can well afford to pay the full price for their children's education.

651. *Mr. Weston.*] Did you find your incidental allowance in Auckland sufficient?—No; I am inclined to think we anticipated a portion of our Building Account for that purpose. To a very great extent the incidental allowance has always been a trouble in our district.

652. I presume your Auckland schools have not very large playgrounds?—Those in the city are fairly large. Mr. Stewart's school has about 3 acres altogether.

653. From what you say, I understand the incidental allowance has been supplemented by supplies from the building grant or from special grant?—In other words, we have never been able to live within our true income.

654. Have you, on your allowance, been able to afford any relief to the widows of deceased teachers, or to give any material assistance to teachers who are invalided?—On some occasions. We have tried to do what is right, but we have not the funds. On one occasion a schoolmaster was past his work and we kept him on, but relieved him from attendance at the school for something like twelve months on full salary. In another instance two of the teachers died suddenly, and we made a grant of two and three months' salary to the widows.

655. I have often felt ashamed of our inability to afford substantial relief in this respect. Do you consider that sufficiency of consideration has been shown to our lady teachers in schools, say, from 250 to 500 under the proposed scale and under the scale you are working under in Auckland?—There has always been a marked difference between the salary paid to lady teachers and those paid to male teachers. We really proceed under no system at all. There is such a very great supply of lady teachers we can really get them on our own terms. I think the highest salary we have ever paid to an assistant lady teacher is £120 a year.

656. I take it you mean that, whether £4 capitation allowance be sufficient or not, teachers throughout the colony should be fairly paid?—Certainly, seeing they are one of the most important sections of the community, you should give them such a salary as will enable them to do justice to the position they hold.

657. *Mr. Hogben.*] I understood that you have to supplement the amount paid to the Committee under the head of incidental expenses?—We have allowed so much per head in our scale for expenditure. In special cases we have to make special grants, and in one year, at any rate, the amount for building and for incidental expenses at the disposal of the Board was so small that the Board considered they should reduce the teachers' salaries all round, which they did by another scale, and saved some money to recoup the building fund.

658. Would these additional expenses also go under the head of incidental expenses?—Of course, they would each go under their proper heading.

659. Then, as to the equal payment of men and women, what is your opinion?—I am afraid it is not within the range of practical politics. I, however, think if one unit does the same work of the same value as another unit, you should pay each unit an equal amount.

660. Have you ever considered Comté's theory of equal pay for equal burden: if the responsibility of the worker is greater the burden is greater, and the pay should be greater?—I have not sufficiently considered it to express a decided opinion. Certainly, if the responsibility is greater the pay should be greater, but I am talking about equal responsibility. If you take a young man of twenty-two, and a girl of twenty-one or twenty-two, and they do exactly the same work, the responsibility of the young man is no greater than that of the girl.

661. But, as Mr. Wood put it yesterday, the young man is entering on a profession for life. The average woman does not do so. Then, the young man has to lay by money to be married, and to maintain a wife and family: do not you think on that ground the burden and responsibility of the estate he is likely to enter should make his salary higher than that of the woman?—I admit it is not practicable at the present time to put men and women on an equal footing with regard to wages. All I say is, I think it is abstract justice.

663. *The Chairman.*] We have been asked about some schools in Auckland, half-time schools. You do not think that system is altogether a satisfactory one?—I think it is the best under the circumstances. Instead of having two small schools with an average attendance of 7 or 8 children, ten or fifteen miles apart, and a teacher at starvation salary for each, it is better to have one teacher with a good salary to visit each place three days a week.

664. In that case would the children receive the same amount of education as they would if they were at the full-time schools?—No; but if they did not have this, probably they would have no education. Of course it is harder work for the teacher.

Mr. Stewart: In the half-time schools the teacher sets a certain amount of work for the three days he is not there, and a certain amount of education on the part of the child is going on in the interval.

Mr. Luke: The work done in the half-time schools is satisfactory, and the children turn out very well.

Mr. Weston: We have one half-time school in our district.

Mr. Hogben: The industrial training-ships at Home are really half-time schools, and the boys do as well as in ordinary day-schools.

665. *The Chairman.*] Do you approve of the salaries being taken away from the control of the Board and put under the control of the department?—Yes; I think the department would act fairly.

666. I think you will remember, some years ago, the Government of the day reduced the whole of the salaries of Civil servants by 10 per cent. Do you not think that might happen again?—I think it might.

667. After all, teachers might be jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire?—My opinion is that, with a colonial scale, you can staff the schools on a consistent and logical basis, and pay teachers better than they are being paid now.

668. Do you not think it would be necessary to depart from the capitation system? Supposing there is a falling-off in the birth-rate, what would happen then to the teacher?—All I can say is, it will affect more than the teachers. There is, however, I think, no serious falling-off in the birth-rate in Auckland.

669. While you were a member of the Auckland Board, did you have any difficulty in filling vacancies?—It depended on the class of vacancy. For these small schools we had a difficulty.

670. Say, for a vacancy with a salary of £150 and upwards?—We had some difficulty in obtaining applications from male teachers in the higher schools. The applications were almost invariably from teachers in a lower grade.

671. In connection with vacancies of £100 and under, what kind of applications did you receive?—As a rule, we did not ask for applications. We took our own list of teachers, and appointed one. We only advertised for applications for schools where the salaries amounted to £200 a year.

MONDAY, 13TH MAY, 1901.

E. M. WATKINS, B.A., Principal of the Normal School, examined.

Mr. Watkins: The first point I should like to notice is that I think in the table the pay proposed to be allotted to the pupil-teachers is relatively higher than it should be: it runs up to £55, while the lowest pay for assistant teachers is £80. I think that, in consideration of the fact that the pupil-teacher is also receiving instruction for which fees are paid by the Government, the ratio is too high. As the question is associated with that of bringing young people into the profession, I should like to say that if there is a deficiency of suitable young people it is due mainly to the fact that the hard work the pupil-teacher has to do necessitates his reducing his time for recreation and amusement, and to the lack of prospect of substantial remuneration at a fairly early date in his career as a certificated teacher. With regard to any supposed deficiency in the number

of male pupil-teachers entering, I am inclined to think that that matter has been rather magnified. I have made out a list of the students entering the Christchurch Normal School for the past twenty years. They have nearly all been pupil-teachers, so that the ratio of male and female pupil-teachers may to a considerable extent be gauged by this, and I do not think you will find there is any great reduction in the percentage of male pupil-teachers. This list goes back for twenty years, and gives the number of new students entering each year. In 1880 there were 13 new students, 4 of them males; in 1881 there were 18 new students, 7 of them males; in 1882 there were 28 new students, 8 of them males; in 1883 there were 29 new students, 8 of them males; in 1884 there were 33 new students, 7 of them males (or 6 only if we except one that was in on trial for three months); in 1885 there were 29 new students, 14 of them males; in 1886 there were 41 new students, 11 of them males; in 1887 there were 54 new students, 18 of them males; in 1888 there were 24 new students, 7 of them males; in 1889 there were 23 new students, 10 of them males; in 1890 there were 35 new students, 11 of them males; in 1891 there were 38 new students, 11 of them males; in 1892 there were 36 new students, 8 of them males; in 1893 there were 55 new students, 16 of them males; in 1894 there were 37 new students, 10 of them males; in 1895 there were 42 new students, 15 of them males; in 1896 there were 36 new students, 10 of them males; in 1897 there were 37 new students, 11 of them males; in 1898 there were 34 new students, 7 of them males; in 1899 there were 26 new students, 6 of them males; in 1900 there were 33 new students, 15 of them males; in 1901 there were 24 new students, 4 of them males. This year is an unusually low one as regards new students, and the number of males last year again was unusually high. With regard to the matter of the supposed insufficient supply of male teachers several things have to be considered. In the first place, a large town school consists of three divisions—infants, girls, and boys—and in all such schools there is a preponderance of infants. For the work of infant-schools females have been found to be best, and for the working of girls' schools it has hitherto been considered that females are more suited; that would make at least two-thirds of the teachers females. Then, if we go to the country schools: where there are one or two pupil-teachers they would require to do a considerable amount of work in the infant department, and therefore females would be preferred. I think it has been said that there is not a sufficient supply coming forward, and that teachers should be drawn from the highly-cultured classes. I have not yet had any evidence that the present *personnel* of the members of the staff in the schools is of such a low type as to necessitate a change in respect to the grade of society from which they are taken. If it had been laid down that teachers were only to come out of the well-to-do cultured classes, I, for one, should have been cut out of the service. That might have been no disadvantage, but there are many other teachers who have done good work, and who would also have been struck out. I am haunted by a suspicion that our headmasters are setting up a somewhat too high standard in their estimate of what candidates are able to take up pupil-teachers' work. Judging by last year I see no falling off in intelligence or industry—the fall in numbers of our students has been due almost entirely to the fall in the number of pupil-teachers in the schools. Some years ago the Board, in its desire not to have the teaching-market overcrowded, and not to have an undue preponderance of pupil-teachers, cut down the number allowed in the schools, and that in itself has brought about the fall in the number of fourth-year pupil-teachers passing on to their certificate. It has been pointed out that a master with 19 pupils and E2 grade, as indicated by number, is very high. I might say that with regard to young teachers, it seems to me that this will work out rather harshly. Most of our young teachers, on obtaining the certificate D5—the lowest (as regards the number) to entitle them to hold a school—apply for a country school, and their penalising will be rather severe. It will be £16, and they cannot rise to a higher number by any effort of their own. A young man might, by a strong effort, raise himself in certificate as regards the letter, but not in number. Then, I would call attention to the D1 required for a country school, with a salary of £174 and increment capitation. But a young teacher may go into a town school and get £180 as second assistant on D3; he may even hold a town appointment that will give £220 on a D3. I think that is an anomaly that might in justice be prevented. Then, there is the capitation grant increasing as the school rises. I notice that comes entirely to the head-teacher. If the increase in the school comes from increased efficiency and method, it occurs to me that it might be possible that that increased efficiency may be contributed to by some of the junior teachers; and, therefore, is it fair that the whole of the increased capitation should go to the head-teacher? There is another matter to which I should like to refer if I am in order in doing so, as it has been referred to by a previous witness. I refer to the expenditure on the Normal School. It has been represented, and witnesses who have given evidence here have thought, that it was unjust and perhaps illegal to expend money on the students in the Normal School. I claim that these students are teachers: they have served a term of apprenticeship as pupil-teachers, they teach here now, and should be entitled to some pay just as much as pupil-teachers are. I myself claim that I am a teacher and have to teach for the Board. At the same time, I should be glad to see the Board's finance relieved from the expenditure on the Normal School. I claim that there is no positive injustice in the action the Board has taken.

672. *Mr. Davidson.*] It seems to me that your desire is that the clever children of poor people should have an opportunity of entering the teaching profession?—Yes.

673. And you object to the suggested scale of pay on the ground that it is too high?—No, not that it is too high, but that relatively it is too high when compared with the pay given to assistants.

674. If the pupil-teacher pay were made lower than that which is suggested, would it not probably prevent the children of poorer people entering the service?—I doubt if it would.

675. Do you think that if the salary is high parents will be more likely to allow their children to go in for the profession?—I think the smaller pay is sufficient to maintain a child, and I think that parents would be quite willing to accept it.

676. You object to the minimum salary in this scale as being too low: what do you suggest in place of £80?—If there is money enough I would suggest £90.

677. You seem to object to the power of the selection of pupil-teachers being in the hands of the head-teacher?—No, I do not.

678. In speaking of the large percentage of female teachers entering the service you said if a proper method was adopted there would be no unduly large percentage of female teachers?—Yes, I said that.

679. Are you aware that in Otago the pupil-teachers are selected by the Inspectors, with the approval of the Education Board?—I am not.

680. Do you think that a better system than what is adopted in this district?—The method I should like to see is one of examination for intending candidates for pupil-teacherships, and that the Inspectors after that examination should approve of a certain number of candidates, and that selection should be limited to that group of candidates, the selection to be made by some method in which the headmaster should have the predominant voice.

681. When a school increases in average attendance, who is it that has the increased work in the way of supervision, organization, and classification of pupils?—The headmaster, perhaps, up to a certain stage.

682. As the school increases in average attendance the staff is also increased?—Yes.

683. And the other assistants still remain class-teachers?—Yes.

684. And probably have no increased work to do in accordance with the increased attendance?—The work of all classes might increase.

685. The average number of children in a class will not rise to any extent, will it?—Not the average number; but suppose an assistant master in a school is popular, and makes himself liked by the children, and acquires a reputation as a suitable teacher, then as the attendance of his class increases the average of the school increases; and, if it does so through the exceptional merit of some particular teacher, the increase in that teacher's work would be as great as the increase in the work of supervision on the part of the headmaster.

686. Generally speaking, you would say that the headmaster should receive the increase in capitation?—I would not say the whole of it, but a substantial part of it.

687. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you say that the teacher's pay is sufficient to attract good minds?—Yes, it will attract good minds.

688. What proportion of your students, on leaving the Normal School, find employment in your own district?—The majority of them do.

689. What is the percentage?—We have sent out about eight hundred; and a short time ago I counted in the *Gazette* sixty-seven names of our former students engaged in other districts. The number might run up to eighty if I could locate them all.

690. Do you conclude that all the others find employment in your own district?—No; it follows, though, that they are employed or have been employed.

691. There are 390 assistant teachers in the district?—Against that you have to put those who have got married.

692. The Normal School is supported entirely out of the Board's funds?—No; partly out of the general funds.

693. How much this year?—£500.

694. Out of what?—This year, I think the expenditure will be £1,700.

695. That will leave £1,200 to be provided out of the district's funds?—Yes; but it must be remembered that if this school was abandoned as a Normal School it would still have to go on, and we should be entitled to nine pupil-teachers at £30 a year each, which would mean £270.

696. What do you think is the right course to follow: for individual Boards out of the school maintenance funds to keep up the Normal School or to go under the control of the Government, and be supported by the Government funds?—I am not prepared to say that we should go under the control of the central Government or should not; but I think it is a most desirable thing to have a sum allotted to the Board for the maintenance of the Normal School.

697. It should not come out of the ordinary capitation fund?—It would be more desirable to have a special grant.

698. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Do you take your pupils from other districts?—It has been the custom recently to deal with any applications from outside districts on their merits; but lately any application from a pupil-teacher from another district has been favourably considered.

699. Would they have to pay anything?—No; but the Board would not make them any maintenance allowance.

700. *Mr. Hogben.*] Are you aware that if the minimum certificates were lowered increased salaries would be given to teachers holding the lower certificates?—Just so.

701. You do not object to the principle of deduction, but to the relative value pertaining to the letter and figure?—Yes, to the relative deductions.

702. Do you not think that the boy or girl coming from the primary school and getting a scholarship would jeopardize his chances of gaining university honours if he were to serve his time as a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

703. Is it not rather hard on him, and a loss to the country, that he should be cut out of the teaching profession?—No.

704. You do not want the best boys in the profession?—Yes; but I hesitate to say that the schools should, to some extent, be sacrificed, as they would have to be if everything was considered from the point of view of giving the boys means of obtaining university honours.

705. These boys and girls are from primary schools, their parents are not wealthier than others, yet it is extremely difficult for them to enter the teaching profession?—They may enter as pupil-teachers.

706. After taking their degree?—Yes.

707. Have you noticed that the salaries of assistants increase from grade to grade as the attendance increases?—Yes; they increase in groups.

708. Do you not think it would be rather complicated to give increases to assistants for individual increases in the average attendance?—I dare say there is that difficulty.

709. Do you think it well to confine entrance to the profession to those who have been pupil-teachers?—I think it would be better if all who entered had to serve the pupil-teacher course at the time of life at which they will best pick up methods of teaching. If the instruction in teaching is delayed too long, I think the teacher is less likely to pick up these ideas and methods. This question has been under discussion at Home lately, and there seems to be a large agreement of opinion that it is a mistake to delay a young man's entrance to practical teaching too long.

710. Does that involve a four years' teaching course?—I would not necessarily say a four years' pupil-teacher course; but if young people are not brought in until they have obtained university honours their entrance will be delayed too long, and a large number will not pick up the methods of work that have to become almost automatic in a teacher.

711. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you not think, if you have a pupil-teacher working during the evening and studying at the university, that when he comes to school next day he has lost that energy which is necessary for the proper conduct of his school duties?—There is no doubt about it. He has not that brightness necessary for the successful management of a class.

712. Then, would it not be well to take that course separately?—If the question is, which he should take first, in such case I distinctly say he should take the practical course first.

713. *Mr. Hill.*] Some of the students that come to your training-school hold certificates first?—Yes.

714. Do you find them better teachers than the others, as a rule?—I do not think they are found to be better teachers.

715. Do you think that scholarship is the great ideal that we should try to obtain in our teachers?—No.

716. Do you think, assuming this scale submitted by the Inspector-General for consideration were adopted, that any injustice would be likely to result to teachers at present in charge of schools—say, men in charge of schools and having a D1 certificate?—I think, if applied at once, it would be unjust.

717. Supposing an arrangement could be made whereby students could enter your training-school simply for the purpose of being prepared for the profession of teachers, would not that enable you to start them better than having a lot of young people doing a kind of mechanical service for three or four years?—I do not think that pupil-teachers have done mechanical service for three or four years.

718. Do you not think that if they came fresh to you, and you were to deal with the processes and methods of teaching, and give criticism lessons and discuss reasons, then, on having that training, send them out into the country ready prepared to do their work: do you not think that would be better than the present system?—I should say not.

719. You think it would be better to give them a term of pupil-teachership?—Yes; we could not secure anything like the same results by training them only in the Normal School.

720. *The Chairman.*] Do you think sixteen years and a half is rather an early age for pupil-teachers starting their course?—It would undoubtedly be better to have the age higher. I think sixteen is a good age for a boy or girl to start teaching work.

721. You have said that the teaching profession offers more avenues of employment for females than males: is it due, as you stated, to the natural cause that there are more females employed?—Yes.

722. Do you think that if there was a demand for boys there would be any difficulty in getting them?—I hear teachers saying there is great difficulty, but I cannot bring myself to believe that the result of Canterbury education has been such a failure.

723. Do I understand you to say that you think a period of preparatory training should be required before young people enter the profession as pupil-teachers?—A few months to satisfy the master and the Inspector that the candidate has really in him the making of a successful teacher.

724. You think the salary of a junior assistant in the town should be the same as the salary of a teacher in the country?—It is rather difficult to answer at once, but I think especially that a mistress who goes to the country should receive a salary that could be looked upon as compensation for doing so.

725. Are you aware whether there is any deficiency of teachers to fill vacancies?—There is none at present.

726. Do you think the profession is overstocked?—I doubt whether it is so; I am inclined to think not.

727. Do you think the profession is failing to attract good material?—I do not see any evidence of it.

728. When a school becomes too large for a master, what assistance do you think should be first provided?—I think, if it can be managed, it is better to have a mistress.

729. You do not think the teaching profession should be confined to those holding scholarships, or those holding high university degrees?—Certainly not; to do that would be to displace many in the profession who do not hold those honours in favour of others not so well qualified as teachers.

730. You know there are precocious children who have phenomenal memories, and can gain certificates without much trouble: do you think they turn out good teachers?—It has often been found that a young fellow who holds a university status does not show capacity for teaching. On the other hand, it often happens that the two things are combined.

J. R. Brunt, representing the East Christchurch School Committee.

The Chairman: The Commission will be very glad to hear what you have to say.

Mr. Brunt: I appear before you with reference to the incidental allowance we receive at the present time. We find that the present allowance is less than we can do with. Our main school has 1,145 scholars, including the infants, and we also have a side-school at Philipstown, making a total roll number of 1,419. The average attendance at the main school is 987, and the total allowance for the main school not sufficient to enable us to make both ends meet. The amount received was £249 12s. 9d. I put in a statement showing the receipts and expenditure. [Exhibit 39.]

Geo. F. Henry, Secretary of the East Christchurch School Committee.

The Chairman: We shall be pleased to hear what you have to say, Mr. Henry.

Mr. Henry: As a member of the East Christchurch School Committee, I can assure you we have had great difficulty in meeting the expenses of our school. During last year we got behind £5 per month, and this induced me to frame the following resolution, which was passed at the last annual meeting of householders: "That the members of the Board of Education be asked to go through the books and vouchers of the East Christchurch School, in order that they may see that the incidental allowance has not been carelessly or unnecessarily spent; that the present indebtedness of the Committee is unavoidable; that the Board be asked to make a special grant to enable the settling of outstanding accounts; and, further, that as experience has shown that the allowance made for incidental expenses is inadequate (being from £7 to £8 per month less than is absolutely necessary), the Board be asked to increase the amount so as to give the East Christchurch School Committee at least another £75 per annum." The difficulty seems to me to begin when the attendance reaches 500. At that stage the allowance drops from 5s. 4d. to 2s. 6d., which means in our case that we get £130 for an average attendance of 500, and, as we have 987, we only get £60 for the additional 487.

T. Hughes, representing the North Canterbury Branch of the Educational Institute, examined.

The Chairman: We shall be pleased to hear what you have to say in reference to the matter before the Commission.

Mr. Hughes: On behalf of the Institute I have to say that it is strongly in favour of a colonial scale of salaries and staffs. In this district we have been subjected to several reductions—in 1888, 1894, and in 1900. The 1900 reduction was specially irritating to us, because it was done in the face of general prosperity throughout the colony, and it created unrest and demoralisation among the teachers of North Canterbury. There is also a certainty of another reduction in 1901 unless this scale brought forward is adopted. The reductions are necessitated, I believe, because of the shortage of the Board's funds. The vote for inspection is £500, and the cost of inspection is £1,655. Then the training-college vote is £300, whilst the cost is £1,150; so that the Board receives £800 to carry on most necessary work which entails a cost of £2,615. The colonial scale, we believe, will also deal with matters from a colonial standpoint, and this can best be done in that way. With regard to the staffing itself, this is a preliminary measure, and we are strongly imbued with the idea in North Canterbury that a liberal and an efficient staff should be given, that the children may be educated thoroughly for the duties of citizens. By this I mean that the staff should be of such a character as to provide for the true education of the children for their work in life. If the State simply wants children to leave school with a certain amount of information that they are likely to forget in a very short time, that is one thing. If, on the other hand, they wish that the children should be well educated—mentally acute, and able to use their eyes and hands—I say that we must have men and women who are really able to undertake that work, or men and women who understand the nature of the problem they have to take up. If so, these men and women must be paid well. We must undertake some measure of technical education in our schools, otherwise we will not be able to successfully take our place among the nations. We generally believe that generous treatment of education is the truest economy. These are the general views of the Institute. We believe there should be minimum wages for teachers; and, secondly, that, although the average salary should be as high as possible, there should be prizes in the profession to attract the best men and women who are highly capable and whose characters are high. Regarding the questions I have been asked to bring forward by the Institute, I have them written here, and will ask you to allow me to put them in as an exhibit. [Exhibit No. 47.] One remark with reference to this scale. We believe the certificate advocated is inconsistent and too high for the smaller schools; inconsistent, because a teacher may hold the position of first assistant in a school of 600 with a D3 certificate, whereas a teacher of a country school of 75 must have a D1. We also think that the assistant master at £190 could very well receive £200, and the first female assistant at £110 should, I think, receive some special consideration, as she is head of a department.

731. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you think it possible to carry on inspection at a cost cheaper than £1,668?—No.

732. Do you believe in Inspectors being placed under the control of a central authority?—Personally, I think they should be.

733. How many children, on an average, do you think a sole teacher should be intrusted with?—Say, 35.

734. Do you think the higher salaries in the service just now sufficient to induce the best-qualified persons to enter the service?—Not the best qualified. I think the highest salaries should be £400, with a residence.

735. What is your opinion about supplying houses for teachers in town?—I think it would be better to give the headmaster an allowance out of the building grant, and allow him to find his own dwelling. Of course, in the country it would be impossible to do that.

736. Have you considered the Otago system of payment to teachers?—It is much higher.

737. Do you think it possible to add to the larger schools a technical department under the control of an expert who has knowledge of the controlling industries of that centre? Take a school in an agricultural district?—I do not think it wise to establish such a department in connection with every school, but I think something in the country could be done in that way by grouping the schools in certain districts.

738. I do not know whether you have studied what is done in Germany. For instance, in a mining district they add mining to the schools, and in an agricultural district they give training in agriculture in the schools?—But that instruction is given out of school-hours, and is not part of the school-work at all. I think if it could be worked in groups of schools it could be managed very well. It would be impossible to obtain proper expert teaching for each school.

739. In Germany the instruction I allude to is given in school-hours. Under our present system of instruction, do you not think that the instruction given in our schools has the effect of diverting youths from following the industries of their own locality?—Yes, possibly that is so.

740. Do the brighter pupils from your schools follow the leading industries in the various communities?—Not so much as I think it is for the good of the colony they should.

741. Does not our system, therefore, divert our ablest youths from the real permanent industries, instead of leading them in that direction?—It does to some extent.

742. Is it not a fact that the Civil Service attracts more than do the agricultural and mining industries of the country?—Yes, probably.

743. Then, in the application of technical instruction, might not that guide them into the industries that are the backbone of the country?—Yes; I think that a good technical school—but not one established at every primary school—would do so.

744. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is your present position?—Master of a school of 430.

745. Supposing the average attendance was 420 and it increased to 421, thus getting into another grade, what would be the difference in salary per annum?—4s.

746. What would the difference in salary of the first male assistant be?—£10 10s.

747. Do you agree with the opinion given by a previous witness that the assistants are not considered in this gradation?—It struck me that the assistants were considered; but in the case you mention that is a glaring inconsistency in the witness's evidence.

748. You are headmaster in a school in the suburbs having an average attendance of 420 to 480?—Yes.

749. What is the staff allowed by the suggested scale?—A headmaster, an infant mistress, three female assistants, three male assistants, and five pupil-teachers.

750. In your experience, have you found that the average woman is capable of teaching the Fourth Standard in such a school as yours as well as a junior male assistant?—In my experience, certainly not.

751. Are you of opinion, then, that in schools about the grade of 420 there should be at least three male assistants on the staff?—Yes.

752. Have you noticed the difference in cost if that were allowed?—I have not.

753. Do you think the efficiency of teaching in such schools would be materially improved if three male assistants were on the staff?—Yes, I do.

754. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You said that, on the whole, the proposed scale of staffs and salaries would suit schools like the one of which you are headmaster?—Certainly, the proposed scale is not too liberal, but it is a liberal one.

755. Are the teachers in this district in favour of a superannuation scheme or retiring-allowance?—As an official of the Teachers' Institute, I should say so, most decidedly.

756. I think you said that you considered there were too many pupil-teachers?—Yes.

757. Would you be in favour of the substitution of one assistant for two pupil-teachers where such could be adopted in the larger schools?—Yes; but, of course, not that pupil-teachers should be done away with altogether.

758. Do you find teachers with high certificates getting the preference under the Board, or are they ignored more or less?—I do not think they are ignored, or that they get the preference.

759. The Board generally abides by the recommendation of the School Committee?—Six applications are sent down to the School Committee, and the Committee accepts one of the six, and their recommendation is generally respected.

760. Do you consider that the North Canterbury Board is too liberal in the establishment of small schools, which must mean a reduction of the teachers' salaries?—Yes, in the past; but I do not know that at present it is so. My own opinion is that the Government should make special provision for new settlements, and fix a minimum number for which a school should be granted.

761. Do you think it possible to make any differentiation in respect to teachers in the two classes of districts—where the cost of living is high and where the cost is low?—That is a difficult matter; but I know that on the West Coast, compared with Canterbury, the cost of living is higher, and I think that some differentiation should be made.

762. Of course, you understand that the difficulty would arise even in the same educational district?—Yes.

763. If this scheme is adopted, do you think that the reduction should be made immediately the scheme was introduced, or not until fresh appointments were made?—I think, to introduce this reduction at once would entail great hardships.

764. What is the opinion of the North Canterbury Teachers' Institute with regard to the separation of the sexes in the large town schools?—I do not think they have expressed any opinion.

765. Teaching would be more economical and more efficient if separation was not effected, would it not?—Yes.

766. Do you consider the percentage in counting the working-average too low at half of the roll-number?—Yes; I think it should be three-fifths.

767. Does the North Canterbury Board, to the knowledge of teachers, trench on the Teachers' Fund for the purpose of maintaining or erecting buildings?—Not that I am aware of.

768. Do you consider that there should be differentiation in the syllabus between the work expected in a small country school and that which might be expected in a larger town school where they are fully staffed?—I think that is provided for by the allowance made for collective teaching. With such grouping there is no necessity for differentiation.

769. Are you in favour of the establishment of side-schools, instead of making pupils, as far as possible, attend the central schools?—Generally speaking, no.

770. *Mr. Hill.*] How many assistant mistresses have you in your school at the present time?—Two, excluding the infant mistress.

771. How many do such mistresses teach?—One teaches between 60 and 70—say, an average of 60.

772. How many does the other teach?—She has to teach quite as many as that. In one case I gave a pupil-teacher, and the other has a monitor unpaid.

773. Has the mistress who has the monitor made good passes in her work?—Yes.

774. How many pupils has your assistant master?—He has about the same number, but a much higher standard, and the subjects are more numerous.

775. But each teacher is responsible for his or her standard work?—Subject to any assistance the headmaster could give.

776. Do you render assistance to the lady teachers?—Yes; in one case I teach the arithmetic and grammar.

777. Is there any difference in the salary paid to these teachers?—One gets £107, and the other £85 to £90.

778. What is the salary of the assistant master?—£145 by the Board's scale.

779. Do the mistresses teach any subjects that the master could not teach?—Yes; domestic economy, sewing, and calisthenics.

780. Do the masters teach anything that the mistresses could not teach?—Yes; military drill and instruction in science.

781. Taking the principal subjects that the masters and mistresses have to teach, are they equal?—Yes.

782. Do you think it is better to have an assistant master for Standard IV. than to have a mistress?—Yes.

783. Where would you put a mistress for preference?—To Standard III. and Standard II. if possible, unless there is a small Standard VI. I have found that she does excellent work there at times.

784. She can do effective work in the other standards?—Yes.

785. Would she do the moral work?—Yes.

786. Do you consider the moral side as important as the physical or the intellectual?—Yes.

787. You say she is intellectually as good and morally as good: why not pay her the same salary?—Because I say distinctly that the work she does is not the same work that the master does.

788. *Mr. Smith.*] Do you think that the attendance should be judged by the roll-number rather than on the average?—Yes.

789. You think it is altogether an improvement, if a proper scheme is provided for the periodical purging of the roll, to pay on the roll-number?—Yes.

790. *Mr. Weston.*] What salary do you think should be paid to a male or female teacher of a small school of from 14 to 19?—I think, £100.

791. Do you think there should be any difference in the salary of the master or mistress of that class of school?—Certainly not.

792. What do you think about schools from 19 to 35, and the salaries of masters or mistresses sent to those schools?—I think they should be as nearly equal as possible.

793. Do you think the amount allocated to these people is sufficient, more especially when the men have to pay £10 to the sewing-mistress?—I think they are not sufficient.

794. What do you think they ought to receive?—The salary is put down here as £118, *minus* £10 if he happens to be an unmarried man. I should like to see the salary fixed at £150.

795. What, then, would be the salary of the mistress of such a school?—I think they should be approximated as nearly as possible; but I think for schools of over 25 a male teacher is preferable and more effective for that class of school.

796. Assuming that they have a female teacher, what do you think should be her salary?—I think there should not be much difference in the salaries of a male and female in those schools.

797. Do you think that the pupil-teachers should have an opportunity to devote half of their school-time to instruction?—I think that is very desirable indeed. It is an ideal system, and one that should be adopted.

798. Do you think it possible to formulate a scale that could be worked?—Yes, for pupil-teachers of the first and second year. I do not think it matters for those of the third and fourth.

799. Do you think that this scale shows an excessive or insufficient number of pupil-teachers for schools of various sizes?—I should like to see them reduced more than this scale does.

800. Can you point to one school?—In my own school we have four, and this scale gives us five. I think four is sufficient.

801. How many pupil-teachers do you think should be reduced?—25 per cent.

802. Are there any difficulties in the way of importing technical instruction into the syllabus as it now stands?—Undoubtedly, the syllabus is overburdened already, and we should need more assistants to teach these subjects.

803. If technical instruction is to become an important subject in your schools, will not the syllabus have to be very materially altered, and will not some subjects now taught have to be excluded?—Yes; I believe it is contemplated that some change will be made, but I believe that contemplated is inadequate.

804. What is the change?—That we shall substitute technical instruction for some class-subject; that means an hour a week, which is inadequate, and does not earn the grant, which provides for two hours a week. Some other subject would have to be curtailed also.

805. Do you, as a teacher of experience, advocate or disapprove of the introduction of technical instruction in the full sense of the word until the children have passed the Sixth Standard?—I would not like to commit myself to that, because there might be some measure of technical instruction given if we were allowed to draw up our own syllabus; but in a general way I believe that technical instruction would be better served by grouping schools in centres, and making adequate provision for instruction, rather than by giving a smattering of the work in our own schools. That would be of great value.

806. In your opinion, are the masters and mistresses of our schools as they now exist qualified to impart technical instruction to the children, or would you need special assistants?—I think special assistants would be needed.

807. Is it really workable for these schools separately to impart manual instruction for children—the mechanical part of the instruction?—With regard to the kindergarten work of certain kinds of modelling, clay, and brushwork, I think if such subjects were introduced gradually it might be done with great advantage.

808. So that manual instruction to be taken up by school-teachers as they now are must be matter of slow growth?—Yes, very slow.

809. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do I understand you to say that money could be saved by doing away with some of the pupil-teachers?—No; there would be increased cost.

810. So that practically doing away with the pupil-teachers would make the system more efficient, but would make the cost more?—That was my contention.

811. *The Chairman.*] I suppose you are in favour of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries?—Entirely.

812. You have thoroughly considered that question?—Yes.

813. And you are satisfied it is wise to take the control of salaries from the Education Boards and invest it instead in the department?—Yes.

814. Do you think that the control of the teachers and Inspectors should also be placed under a central authority?—No; I think the Boards have performed very valuable functions in the past, and so long as that continues I think there is a sphere for the Boards.

815. Do you consider, with regard to your salaries, that you are safer in the hands of members of the House than you would be in the hands of members of Education Boards?—I would rather be in the hands of members of Parliament. I think it is a matter better dealt with from a colonial standpoint than from a local standpoint.

816. Do you think your own school is sufficiently staffed at the present time?—Yes.

817. Do you think it could be improved?—Yes.

818. What do you complain of, quality or quantity?—The quality is quite good enough, but it could be improved if we had more assistance.

819. Do you think, under a national system of education, it is desirable to have one kind of primary instruction in the country and another in the town?—No; I think we ought to have equal opportunity.

820. The instruction in the country should be quite as efficient as in the towns?—Yes.

T. S. Foster, Headmaster of West Christchurch School, examined.

Mr. Foster: I propose to confine my remarks to the circumstances attending the working of our large city schools. I beg to point out that four large schools in Christchurch stand by themselves in point of organization. I do not think there are any others in New Zealand of the same size and organization. My object in attending here is to urge that provision should be made for continuing the present classification—*i.e.*, with separate departments for boys and for girls—a system which has been worked with marked success in Canterbury. The present method of classification affords special opportunities to women for doing a certain class of work which they cannot undertake in classes where boys and girls are taught together. Many female teachers feel that in mixed schools their experience is confined to the work of the middle and lower standards, but the system I advocate gives them an opportunity of teaching the upper standards under favourable conditions. It has the merit of popular approval, and in the case of the girls' department there is a distinct advantage in having as the head of that department a highly qualified mistress who is in close touch with every girl in the school. In England it is found that in large schools such a system works well, and I am of opinion that in those New Zealand schools in which it is already in force it should be continued. With regard to the proposed scale, I may say that on the whole it has many points to recommend it; but, while the majority of schools would be staffed more liberally under this scale than they are now, in my own school I should lose one assistant teacher from my present staff. I freely recognise that the small schools can only be worked by making substantial savings on the large ones, but there is a danger of going too far in this direction. I may add that if the large schools in this city are to be staffed according to the proposed scale considerable alterations will have to be made in the structure of the school-buildings.

821. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you aware that in the Australian Colonies there are many schools quite as large as the one you mention, and there is no separation of the sexes ?—Yes, I am aware of that.

822. Could you tell me how many pupils you have in Standard II. ?—121.

823. It is necessary to divide a class of that size into two divisions ?—Yes.

824. If you are classifying 121 children, would you think it wiser to classify according to sex or attainments ?—I should prefer to classify them according to sex.

825. Do you not think it would be better to have junior and senior divisions, according to their attainments, apart altogether from the question of sex ?—The method you suggest could be worked as efficiently as the other way.

826. Have you ever tried the system of mixing the sexes ?—I work it in Standard VII.

827. Do you find any disadvantage in having the sexes mixed in the Seventh Standard ?—No, I am not working to any disadvantage by having the sexes mixed.

828. *Mr. Stewart.*] What has been your experience with regard to the male pupil-teachers : have you had an adequate supply ?—I have had no difficulty in finding a suitable candidate, but I have only one male pupil-teacher at present on my staff, so a vacancy rarely occurs.

829. Why do you think there are so many applications from country teachers to come to the town schools ?—To further their education, and for the social advantages they gain.

830. Do you think that the fact that many country schools have no houses attached to them would have any influence on town teachers applying for country positions ?—I think it would.

831. On very wet days do you have many occasions on which you have just a few more than half the roll-number ?—Yes.

832. How far do you think the number should be raised ?—I think three-fifths would be fairer than the present number.

833. Have you had much experience in moderately sized or small schools ?—I have had no experience of country schools.

834. Do you consider that the salaries teachers at present receive enable them to save or put by money for their old age ?—Only in a few cases.

835. Then, you favour the introduction of a superannuation scheme or retiring-allowance ?—I do.

836. Do you consider that better facilities should be given for transferring teachers from one school to another by mutual exchange ?—I think that such a system has much to recommend it.

837. Would you favour the promotion of teachers in larger schools rather than giving the opportunity to outsiders ?—I think every vacancy should be advertised, and open to all competitors.

838. *Mr. Hill.*] How many male and female teachers have you in your school ?—Six male (including headmaster) and six female teachers, and nine pupil-teachers.

839. Do you supply as many adult teachers proportionately to the infant department as to the higher standards ?—No.

840. How is your staff distributed : do you place the first assistant master to the highest standard ?—No ; the first assistant master takes the Fifth Standard. That is the largest class in my school, and I assign it to the highest-salaried teacher.

841. Do you do so in the case of the female assistants ?—Yes.

842. In Standard VI. do you separate the boys from the girls ?—They are worked separately.

843. How many boys are there in Standard VI. ?—51.

844. How many girls are there in Standard VI. ?—44.

845. Can you give me the number of pupils you have in Standard IV., girls ?—59, with an additional class of 20 taught with 13 boys in another room.

846. Who teaches them—the ones in the other room ?—A pupil-teacher.

847. Has the mistress the supervision of them ?—Partly. They also go into her room for domestic economy and for singing.

848. She is responsible for some of the work of the other class ?—A little of it.

849. Then, we may say the female teachers have as many pupils as the male teachers ?—Generally so.

850. And the females are responsible for the work of the standard, just the same as the male assistants ?—Yes.

851. Do females teach anything men cannot teach ?—Men do not teach sewing.

852. Any other subject ?—Domestic economy. Men can teach that, but they generally take science instead.

853. In that case you require the females to teach as many subjects as the males ?—Yes.

854. All things combined, can a man teach more primary subjects than a woman ?—Just about the same.

855. Do you find any difference in regard to their capabilities for handling their classes ?—They handle their girls as well as men do their boys.

856. Can men teach more pupils ?—I have less compunction in adding ten pupils to a man's class than to a woman's.

857. Because they have more salary ?—Because they can face the worries better.

858. You confess teachers are much worried ?—The management of large classes is a heavy tax on their strength.

859. You confess that relatively it costs more to maintain a small school than a large one ?—Yes.

860. Therefore a school of 50 costs relatively more than a school of 100, per head ?—Yes.

861. And 200 more than 400 ?—I do not quite know where the graduated scale ends, but there should be a limit to it somewhere. I do not know whether you can carry it beyond small schools.

862. Where is the limit, in your experience ?—I have not worked it out.

863. Let us take a school of 600 pupils fully organized. Suppose we admit another 100 pupils by an influx of population, do you think it would require reorganization?—Do you mean reorganization according to departments, or more classes?

864. A reorganization such as you would deem necessary?—It depends largely on the particular classes affected. The large influx might be children just over five years of age. In the case of many children removing from another district the increased attendance would be felt probably throughout the school.

865. Suppose these 100 pupils were placed in the various classes, could you suggest to us the probable difference in the cost of maintaining your school?—I could not answer this question on the spur of the moment.

866. What increase in the staff do you think would be necessary to staff a school of 700 as compared with 600?—I should require two assistants.

867. Then, you think that would be a fair amount for the school?—I think so.

868. I suppose you are aware of the classification adopted by your Board?—Yes.

869. What is the staff required for a school of 600 pupils?—Six assistants, six pupil-teachers, and a principal teacher.

870. Could you tell us how much their salaries would amount to in the aggregate?—I think you will find it amounts to £1,176. That would be the cost of that school.

871. Will you state how many assistants are required under this scale?—Are there not ten assistants required there, and eight pupil-teachers? And the total cost of a school of 750 children, according to this scale, is £1,852; therefore the difference between them is £676.

872. Do you think that is a proper classification for the schools in your district?—I am taking the staff here up to 600 in schools, and it says the staff is—principal teacher, six assistants, and six pupil-teachers. In a school over—700 that is, up to 750—the staff here is stated to be a headmaster, ten assistants, and eight pupil-teachers. Consequently, there is a difference of four assistants and two pupil-teachers, and a difference in salaries of £676. I am simply working out the amount actually paid under this scale.

Mr. Inspector Wood pointed out that under the scale of the North Canterbury Board a school of an average attendance of 827 had two assistants and a pupil-teacher more than it would have if it were staffed on the mixed-school principle.

873. *Mr. Hill.*] I may say I was not troubling as to the staffing of any particular school, but what I wanted to bring out was that the proposed staffing is based on an improper principle. Under ordinary circumstances you will find that the schools lower in the scale are maintained at much less cost; consequently, under the proposed scale the cost allowed to the higher schools is out of proportion to what is allowed under regulations. Under the proposed scale, are you aware what it would cost?—No.

874. Under the proposed scale a school up to 600 would cost £1,221; with pupil-teachers, £1,466; while under the present system they are run for £1,210: so you see there is a far better allowance under the proposed scale than under your scale as to staffing also. They recognise seven assistants. Do you not think the staffing up to 600 is too small under your Board?—My experience is confined to the work of large schools. It is not fair for me to give an opinion on the working of small schools.

875. Do you not think that that school is more than the maximum size for the efficient working of the school?—Not if it is properly organized.

876. Are not classes duplicated the moment you get over 600—you separate into boys and girls?—Additional classes must be formed in some part of the school.

877. Under conditions like that there is no advantage in having such extraordinarily large schools?—I do not think so.

878. You think really that a school up to 600 is the maximum size for a school?—Not necessarily so. In my own case, and in three other schools here, the division of sexes after passing the First Standard gets over that difficulty.

879. If you have boys and girls you are simply duplicating your staff?—Yes.

880. And you may just as well have another school. Do you think there is any advantage in having a school, say, over 600, or 700 at most?—I do not think so. Personally, I have found no difficulty in working a much larger school, but there is no particular gain.

881. Do you think, from your experience as a teacher, that the wide distinction between the salaries paid to male and female teachers is a good plan to adopt?—Theoretically, the practice appears unfair; but adaptation to environment is one of the laws of nature, and we cannot ignore the law of supply and demand and the social environment of the question. We find it much easier to fill our vacancies with efficient mistresses than with efficient men.

882. Do you think it would be better to bring the best teachers more to a common level in the matter of pay: I am not suggesting that the highest ones be reduced, but the low ones should be raised?—Yes; but I am afraid we cannot work out an ideal scheme on a £4 grant.

883. Do you think it would encourage young men to enter the profession by raising their salaries?—It would certainly act as an inducement.

884. Would you select assistant masters in preference to mistresses?—I prefer masters for boys and mistresses for girls.

885. Supposing Standard VI. was mixed, would you prefer a man or a woman?—If there were a larger proportion of boys I should prefer a man, as I would feel less compunction in asking him to do hard work.

886. But if you put a woman to the same standard you expect her to do the same kind of work as a man?—You are talking about mixed schools, I presume.

887. You put a woman to teach the Sixth Standard girls' class: the girls do the same work as the boys, and the woman teaching them has the same work to do as the master?—Yes.

888. A mistress can take as many pupils as the assistant master can take?—Yes, on the average.

889. And she gets different pay?—Yes.

890. If you were an employer of labour, say, in the boot trade, and you had a man and a woman working for you, and you asked them to make a dozen pairs of boots, would you expect to give the woman less for her dozen pairs than you would for the man doing the same amount of work?—That would depend upon the conditions imposed by the Arbitration and Conciliation Court.

891. Would you expect a woman to get the same money for twelve pairs of boots that a man received?—It would be a fair thing to expect.

892. In that case, if they do the same work in a school, do not you think the same consideration should be shown to the woman as to the man?—I do, if circumstances permit.

893. Do you think this wide difference between male and female teachers in schools, who are called upon to do the same work, should be continued?—I do not think such wide differences should exist.

894. What is your opinion as to the establishment of teachers' certificates pure and simple?—Scholarship does not necessarily imply an efficient teacher.

895. You think there are qualifications necessary for a teacher which the graduate does not always possess?—Yes.

896. Do you attach any importance to physical capacity in your school? Would you prefer a man who had a capacity for teaching swimming, drill, and one who could go into the cricket-field: are not those qualities very valuable to a teacher?—Yes.

897. Would you prefer him to a graduate simply with mental capacities?—I would take the more human of the two; but intellectual and physical capacity are not necessarily divorced from each other.

898. What is your opinion as to the establishment of a superannuation fund?—I think it is greatly to be desired, but it is a question of ways and means.

899. Do you think the retention of 1½ per cent. of the proposed capitation grant would be received by the teachers of the colony with favour, supposing the teachers had part control in the management of such a scheme?—The suggestion appears a good one, but it would be better for the capitation to be raised first.

Miss GLANVILLE, First Assistant Mistress at Woolston School, examined.

Miss Glanville: I am here to represent the first assistant mistresses of the second group of schools according to the scale, but more especially so those with an average of 420 to 600, that being the size of a good many of the schools in the suburbs of Christchurch. You will notice on this scale that the salary put down for such a mistress is £110, the salary of the first assistant master being £190, a difference of £80. As the school increases to 600, the difference between the salary of the first assistant mistress and the first assistant master is increased to £95. While not taking into consideration equal pay for equal work, I think any one looking at it will see that the difference paid in the salaries of these two teachers is very great indeed. The first assistant master in such a school is required to teach a mixed class of Standard V., and the first assistant mistress in such a school has to teach a large mixed class of Standard IV., which is, I think, the most arduous work given to any female teachers in public schools. Being the highest female teacher in her department, she is also required, in addition to her class-work, to supervise the sewing for the school, and actually teaches sewing in most cases to two classes, and in very many cases also supervises a third class under a pupil-teacher in the same room. In addition to this, she is also responsible for the drill of the girls, which has now become a very important matter in our schools, and is recognised as such by the department. To prove that this standard is a most arduous task, there is very great difficulty in this district in finding teachers able to do the work. Such a vacancy occurred for a teacher in this position. The Board the first time of advertising could only find one suitable candidate. At the same time, for an infant-mistress-ship at a similar salary the Board easily found six candidates. The position of first assistant mistress, such as I am now speaking about, was filled at that time by a teacher of long experience with a B2 certificate. The infant-mistress-ship, at the same salary, was filled by a teacher with an E3 certificate with much less difficulty. I do not know of any position among teachers in this district for which the Board could find so few suitable applicants, except, perhaps, that of headmistress in one of the four large schools. As regards the experience and certificates, the average length of time these teachers have been teaching is eighteen years. Their certificates are B2, D1, C2, and not one holds less than a D2 certificate. Seeing that on this scale no certificate is put down as being necessary, I presume that, D3 being the lowest required for a master, probably E4 is required by the department; but I am decidedly of opinion that a teacher holding a certificate of E4 could not do the work, either from point of scholarship or experience. Another thing which puts the first assistant mistress in this school in an unenviable position is the lack of promotion. It has been the custom in Canterbury to promote infant mistresses in smaller schools to the infant-mistress-ships of larger ones. This may be a very good custom in itself, but it has prevented the first assistant mistresses in these schools from looking for promotion of this kind. It might be supposed that they would naturally look for promotion to the four large city schools here, which employ a good many standard teachers; but here, again, they are blocked. The schools invariably promote their own teachers. It has been the custom latterly to advertise for these positions, but even then Committees prefer to promote their own teachers. In the last case of a vacancy occurring they preferred to promote a third assistant to be a first assistant, and give her an increase of £50, rather than take a first assistant mistress from a suburban school and give her a rise of £15; so that, from all points of view, I think the position is a very unenviable one. Apart from the qualifications of these teachers and their length of experience, I think the work in itself is certainly worthy of a higher salary than that ascribed to it in this scale.

900. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you considered the suggested scale?—Yes.
901. What experience have you had as a teacher?—I have been nearly eighteen years teaching.
902. What positions have you filled?—Second, third, and first assistant in the Woolston School.
903. Have you ever filled the position of sole teacher in a country school?—No.
904. Have you considered the salaries suggested to be allotted to the small schools on this scale?—Yes.
905. Up to what average do you think a woman is capable of managing a school single-handed?—Up to about 40, perhaps.
906. Do you think she could manage a school as well as a man could?—I think so.
907. Do you think a man and a woman should receive the same salary for similar positions in a school of that class?—Yes.
908. Do you think that if these positions carried the same rate of pay for men and women, and they were thrown open to either sex, women would probably find themselves excluded from many of the schools?—I am afraid, with the present prejudices, they would.
909. You think, for instance, if the salary attached to a school between 20 and 40 were sufficient to induce a young married man to apply for such school, that, as a rule, School Committees would prefer to take a young married man and his wife into the district rather than a single woman?—Yes.
910. You think, by equalising the salaries in such schools, you would really push women out of the positions they now occupy?—I do not think many women occupy positions in schools as large as that at the present time.
911. You will find, if you look through the Minister's report, that a very large number of women fill schools of this size: do you think that would happen if the salaries were equalised?—I think, under the present circumstances, the Committee would prefer a man. He would live in the district, and the cost of his household would be a little more.
912. You think, rather than equalising the salaries for such a position, and so pushing the women out, it would be better to reduce the disparity existing in the rates of pay?—Yes.
913. Turning to your own school, you said that recently very great difficulty has been experienced by the North Canterbury Board in finding women suitable to occupy the position you referred to—in fact, you say only one suitable candidate was found when applications were invited?—Yes.
914. Does it not strike you there must be something wrong in the arrangement of the staff if so few women are capable of filling the position. If the work is so very arduous, and if the physical strain is so great, would it not be better that a man should be asked to teach the Fourth Standard of 50 or 60 pupils?—I do not think the Third Standard would be very much easier to teach.
915. Is it a fact that it is difficult to obtain suitable women to fill the position?—There is a difficulty here.
916. Do you think they would have very much difficulty in getting suitable mistresses to enter the staff if they had to teach a standard not higher than the Third?—The difficulty would be lessened; but I also think it would be a very difficult matter to get women to teach a mixed Standard III. in a large school.
917. If women are incapable of teaching large standards over the Third and Fourth, surely there should be a difference in the salary paid to men who are capable?—I think there are women capable of doing the work.
918. You said just now it was a difficult matter to find the women?—So it is, very difficult. That does not alter the fact that there are women who have done it well.
919. You consider it is too arduous for the ordinary woman?—It is considered so.
920. *Mr. Stewart.*] I think you said you rose from third to first assistant?—Yes.
921. How long did it take you to do that?—Between eleven and twelve years. In the first place, I was appointed, instead of two pupil-teachers, at a salary of £60. It was not an ordinary assistantship at all, and did not appear on the scale.
922. How long have you been first assistant?—Between seven and eight years.
923. I take it that what you are really finding fault with at the present time is not so much the matter of payment, but the fact that there is no regular system of promotion?—I think the payment is too low for the work done.
924. But supposing the suggested scale came into force, would that meet your difficulty?—Not at all, because the salary is practically less, as the average is higher.
925. You found your way blocked from the school where you are at present appointed as first lady assistant to a school of a larger size?—Completely so.
926. Supposing this scale met all your difficulties with regard to money, would not the difficulty you complain of exist if there were no scheme of promotion?—That is so; but if we were well paid for our work the grievance would not be so great.
927. Your grievance is the system of promotion?—That is one of the difficulties; but another is that the payment is considerably lower than it should be for the work we have to do. At present the salary, in my estimation, is a great deal too low. The first assistant mistress to Standard IV. gets £95 less than the master to Standard V., and she has the supervision of the sewing and drill as well.
928. You spoke of the first assistant male getting £190 and the first assistant female £110. I think you are making a slight mistake. If you fill the position as first assistant in that school, what would you receive by the scale?—£140.
929. The salary you quoted—£110—was for the second assistant, so that the difference would be between £110 and £125?—No, because it specifies below that the first assistant can be a master in those schools.

Mr. Stewart: I do not think that is provided. I fancy you are under a misapprehension of the effects of the scale.

930. *Mr. Luke.*] Irrespective of consequences or contingencies, do you think there should be equal pay for equal work?—I quite believe in the principle, but would be content myself with a little less.

931. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the proposed scale of staff with the staff that exists in your own school just now?—Yes.

932. You know there will be another assistant appointed. Now, the only person whose salary will be affected by the adoption of the proposed scale will be the headmaster?—The second master's salary is altered considerably.

933. He is increased: he would not object to that?—No.

934. Another assistant is getting £135, and will get £140, and you will get from £105 to £110?—It will make no material difference to me. I am now getting £110.

935. The first assistant master will get from £159 to £190?—The first assistant master's position in our school is not too well paid. I think, on the other hand, our salaries have not been increased proportionately.

936. Can the present staff of your school undertake the work comfortably without additional assistants, also without an additional pupil-teacher?—I do not know about having a pupil-teacher. I think we want an additional pupil-teacher; but, as far as assistants are concerned, I think we have a sufficient number.

Miss KITCHINGMAN, Headmistress of the Normal School, examined.

Miss Kitchingman: I may say that I should welcome a colonial scale, if it were a good one, but I cannot say I think the proposed scale would be a good one for the women of the profession, except for the infant mistresses. I do not go so far as to advocate equal pay for equal work. I think the time will come, perhaps, when they will look upon these days as the "dark ages," when they made women work harder for less pay, but at present we must make the best of it; but I think the disparity might be lessened. If you look at the scale it is worse than it appears at first sight. Miss Glanville has already pointed out one thing. If you take any of these assistantships, they are to be taken alternately, and we are quite certain it would be men to take the first positions; therefore it will not be £140, £125, male and female, but it would be the next place, £140, £95, and so on. That is where I think the scale is very deceptive. It is all very well to say a mistress might be first, but we know as a matter of fact she would not. Then, taking all the teachers in the schools, particularly the large schools, where they are divided: On the girls' side the total payment is very much less, about four-sevenths that of the boys, leaving out the principal teacher. I think that is far too great a difference. Something has been said about these schools being divided. If the school is so large it is necessary to divide it in some way; and if it costs more to have a school divided into boys and girls, still it is much cheaper than two schools of half the size, and infinitely better. There is not, to my mind, the slightest doubt about it being better. Girls are better separated from the boys for many reasons. There are certain subjects taught to girls only—sewing, domestic economy, &c. It was said the other day that, while the girls were doing sewing, the boys were doing a subject that had to be done over again. If that is the case, why not have them separated? It could not be done in small schools, but in a large school it could. Besides the sewing and domestic economy, the drill is quite different for the girls. Then, with girls the discipline required is different from that for boys. Corporal punishment in the girls' school is almost entirely done away with, and I only wish it could be done away with altogether. The boys and girls are better separated. If the school is very large the more need is there for separation. A man or woman with a very large class cannot give the supervision required, particularly where the class is mixed. If the class is very large it must be separated on account of the size. Why, then, not separate the boys from the girls? Then, girls' schools have always been in the favour of the children, and I think parents will agree with me that their girls are not worse taught than the boys. If, then, these schools are an advantage there ought to be some allowance extra for the headmistress, but instead, in this scale, she positively is to have less. One can hardly believe it. If there is an assistant mistress it appears she is to have exactly the same salary. If she is an assistant mistress she might have a D3 certificate, and at once be made headmistress, and then, with that certificate, 6 per cent. can be taken off her salary. It is so shocking one can hardly imagine it. Six per cent. less because of the honour of supervising the whole school! Of course, no one would give that position to one with a D3 certificate, but as it stands there that is the position. Now as to certificates: I am very much in favour of some payment of certificates. It would be something for our young people to work for. When they get through a certain amount they are too ready to leave it and say, "We will do for infant mistresses. They get the best salary." There should certainly be something done to encourage our young people to go on. By all means give something extra for high certificates. Now, in a school of 600 the headmaster has a salary of £330 with a house, and if he has a certificate of C1 that is all that is required. By the proposed scale I should have only a salary of £170 or £180, and I lose 1 per cent. because I have not a B. Why not treat us all alike? If a salary of £170 requires a B certificate, why should not the master have a B certificate? Some will say that C1 is better than B2, and so the greater includes the less. If C1 is better than B2, why take off 1 per cent. because you have not got just the certificate named? I should like to see these certificates fairly ranged in one section and treated in that way. As to staffing, I do not wish to disparage the male assistants, but I must say that a more devoted band than the female teachers you will not find. I am not saying that the men are not just as devoted to their work. I have had more to do with the female assistants than the male. It is a profession that one cannot be idle in. There is some-

thing in it which impels you to work, and I must say these young people have worked and do work well. I think there should be something for them to look forward to. I believe our young girls would rather get that £80 per annum for the minimum, and have something to look forward to. I have heard them say, "Well, the headmistress's position should be kept up. It is the only thing we have to look forward to." Those that have got the positions will soon pass away, and there ought to be something for the others to look forward to; but, as it stands here, the headmistress will be just the same as the infant mistress and the first assistant, only a very much higher certificate required. That is very unfair, with all the extra work she is expected to do. Speaking about country and town schools, I think there has been a little too much made of the advantages of the town. I taught in the country for a few years, and a happier time I think I never had. The kindness of the people was unbounded; but I was young and ambitious, and thought I should like to rise higher, and as the angels fell, it appears I am falling now, when the salary has been reduced from £250 down to, I think it will be, £180.

937. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You are in favour of equal pay for equal work?—I think I should hardly go as far as that. I would be satisfied with a three-quarter basis. I know that the master has his wife and family to keep, and I am not asking for impossibilities; but I do think that a headmistress in a large school, who has so large a responsibility, should have £240 or £250 at least.

938. According to the scale, female head-teachers shall be paid 10 per cent. less than males occupying the same position: do you consider that would be too great a difference?—I suppose that is comparing the headmistress with the second master. In most schools there is not an equality of work, because the headmistress does the work of the second master, and oversees the girls as well.

939. In applying the proposed scale of salary to your school, do you find it means more or less general reduction of salaries all round?—Our school is not quite the same as others. £20 is put down to me for training. I should think it would be about £180, instead of £200.

940. With the exception of the headmaster, the first assistant will get an increase of from £226 to £240. One assistant master, if he still retains his position in the school, will get £120, and another £116?—The first assistant female would come down very low. £110, I think, it will be; and our next assistant mistress, a good all-round girl, who has the Fourth Standard, would come down to £90.

941. *Mr. Hill.*] Did I understand you to say that you did not agree that lady teachers should receive the same salaries in small country schools as male teachers?—I think they should.

942. Up to how many—that is, what average attendance?—The only difficulty I can see in women teaching at all is with big boys. To manage big boys is not exactly women's work, nor should a young unmarried man in a country school have to take big girls. So, you see, with both young women and men in country schools there is a little difficulty. Of the two perhaps it would be better to have a man. Before I was nineteen, though, I took charge of a school of 100 children when the master was absent, some of them being boys bigger than myself.

943. *Mr. Hogben.*] What is your own salary, independent of what you get for training?—£186. Some time ago a reduction was made in the headmaster's salary of £5, and of the headmistress', £10.

944. Your salary under this scale would be £190?—Between £190 and £180.

945. That is, with a reduction of 1 per cent., £188 2s.?—But then, just imagine, the infant mistress, who works only about two-thirds the time, gets the same.

946. *The Chairman.*] What you complain of chiefly is that there is such a great difference between the amount paid to the female and male assistants?—Yes; and I think more particularly the headmistress. But all through, although I do not think the men have too much, it is certainly out of proportion.

947. You consider the position of headmistress a much more responsible and arduous one than that of infant mistress?—Yes; look at the proportion of night-work the headmistress has compared with the other mistress.

948. She must be more highly qualified?—Yes, much more highly.

949. You object to the scale because the salaries are the same?—I am not saying anything against the infant mistress's work, but simply that the headmistress has a much harder task. The qualifications are greater, and the work is greater.

950. What is your opinion on the question of house allowance? Do you consider assistants should receive house allowance?—I should be very glad indeed for the assistants to have it.

951. Do you find lady teachers are able to teach as high a number of children as males?—We have not had the slightest difficulty, but with big boys there would be a difference.

952. Is there any difficulty in getting competent lady teachers to take charge of country schools?—If they were well paid they would be only too glad to go.

953. And would they apply for these positions from the town?—Yes.

954. Is the pay considered sufficient in country schools?—No; sometimes it is low, and it is difficult to get lodgings in some of the places.

955. Do you think young lady teachers can live much cheaper in the country than young men?—No; I think it is about the same.

Mrs. Wilkinson (Riccarton School) examined.

Mrs. Wilkinson.] I beg to state very firmly my strong conviction that the infant mistress should in no case be classed as an assistant. In the proposed colonial scale an infant mistress is not allowed until a school reaches an average attendance of over 250, yet nothing is more certain than that in schools far below this number the mistress in charge of the lower classes is as truly an infant mistress as in the larger schools, and cannot be classed as an assistant without grave injustice. We may briefly consider the work of such mistresses. In the smaller schools she will

probably have Standards I. and II., the preparatory classes, and the whole of the sewing, thus being responsible for definite departmental work. When we pass on to schools where the infant department consists of Standard I. and the preparatory classes, the work becomes still more specialised, and begins to be increased by the supervision of a monitor or pupil-teacher, frequently a beginner, and it should not be forgotten that in these schools the infant-room often contains one-third or more of the whole roll-number. In recent years the introduction of kindergarten work has materially increased the duties of the infant mistress. In such schools the headmaster teaches Standards IV., V., and VI., and perhaps also Standard III., so that, as a general rule, his hands are quite full, and the burden and responsibility of the infant department rests almost entirely on the mistress. I have inquired on and verified this point with ample evidence. These responsibilities are very great, as it is here that young children are given their start, and good or bad impulses affecting their future school life. The Boards of the southern provinces, from North Canterbury to Southland, have recognised this, and given a fairly liberal scale of payment to the infant mistresses, and have not classified them, save in small schools, as assistants. In the large schools the salary of the infant mistress has been considerably increased, even beyond the scale allowed now by the southern provinces; but it does not seem to be either just or efficient that the greater number of infant mistresses in these provinces should have their salaries reduced below that scale. The reduction extends from 8 up to 12, and even 15 per cent.—*e.g.*, from £10 to £95, and from £100 to £85 (Otago). The plums in infant-work are not many, and the greater number of us must remain at the average salaries; and I believe that these in any national scale, and viewed from a broad standpoint of what is fit for a life's labour, should provide for comfortable board, clothing, and incidentals, necessary holiday expenses, and provision for old age. In general, these positions are held by adult women, whose needs for strength and work require to be very carefully looked after, and from whom a certain social standing is expected. It has at times been said that if women's salaries were halved there would still be plenty of applicants, so anxious have they shown themselves to enter the teaching profession. I do not think this principle—the principle of letting positions to the lowest bidder—should be allowed to operate in the fixing of any salaries for teachers, whether men or women. It does not hold in secondary schools or in universities, and I do not know that it is allowed in any other branch of the Civil Service. If it did operate, it would bring down salaries much below country ones.

956. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is your present position?—Infant mistress in the Upper Riccarton School.

957. What is the average attendance?—About 171.

958. What is your present salary?—£112 up to the last reduction, now £108.

959. What would you receive under the suggested scale?—£95.

960. Have you ever considered the question how many pupils a woman is capable of teaching single-handed as sole teacher in a country school?—I should think, about 40.

961. Under the suggested scale, what would be the salary of an infant mistress in such a school in North Canterbury?—£80.

962. And in Otago, what do they pay at the present time?—£85.

963. So that in such a school the suggested salary would mean a reduction of £5 to the infant mistress?—Yes.

964. Take the next group of schools, 75 to 100: you say the infant mistress would have to teach the primary classes and Standards I. and II.?—Yes.

965. And she would beside that have to supervise the training of the pupil-teacher?—The pupil-teacher would be divided between the master and mistress.

966. According to the scale here, she would have to do the work stated and supervise the pupil-teacher?—Yes.

967. And the suggested scale here is £90; in Otago it is £100; consequently it would mean a reduction to the women in that class of school of £10 per year. You think the salary is too low?—Yes.

968. Take the next grade, 100 to 150: in Otago, what is the rate paid to infant mistresses?—From 141 to 180—in the suggested scale it is £90. In Otago at the present time it is £105.

969. That is the reduced scale: it has been reduced twice during the past few years, I think?—Yes.

970. Consequently it would mean to women in that grade of school a reduction of £15?—Yes.

971. In your opinion, the reduction is too great, and the suggested salary too low?—I certainly think so.

972. Then, the next grade of school, 150 to 175, or, in Otago, 141 to 180: the suggested salary in this scale is £95; in Otago £108; consequently it means a reduction to the women in that school of £13. Altogether, you consider that the women occupying positions similar to yours are not as liberally treated in this scale as they should be?—I think so.

973. I understand you are infant mistress?—Yes.

974. Practically the infant mistress in that class of school is the first lady teacher?—Yes.

975. In the larger schools where we have first lady assistant and infant mistress what are the relative positions?—We have an assistant, but she does not rank as first assistant.

976. In a large school, such as Miss Glanville is in, do you think the first assistant should be equal to the infant mistress?—Yes.

977. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] According to the proposed scale there would be another assistant in your school?—Not until we get between 175 and 225 pupils.

978. I am talking on the basis of the last report—namely, 179. Can the present staff undertake the work?—Very comfortably.

979. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you think the position of infant mistress in a school is equal to a man's position as first assistant in a school?—I think the position of infant mistress should be as high as that of any other mistress in the school.

980. And do you think that the salary paid should be the same, or pretty nearly the same?—I must say I think so.

981. Have you considered the scale proposed?—Yes.

982. Are you aware that the infant mistress is put down to receive the same salary as the first assistant mistress?—That is only when you reach large schools.

983. There is only one mistress, but up to 175 another assistant would be an assistant master. If the principal teacher is a male, the next must be a female. In a school below 175 would you require two assistant mistresses?

Mr. Hogben: Up to 150 it requires two assistant mistresses.

Mr. Hill: Then, the second assistant mistress would come under the head of first assistant. It would not affect the question of salary at all.

Dr. Anderson: I would point out that in this district when the lady speaks of first assistant she generally means the first female assistant, or, according to this scale, the second assistant in a school.

984. *Mr. Hogben.*] With regard to the salary of mistresses, do you know the salaries under the scale in North Canterbury?—Yes.

985. In a school of 41 to 60, what is the salary of the infant mistress?—£67 10s.

986. You do not think that this scale rises sufficiently rapidly?—That is the great fault in the women's position.

987. Are you aware that the average salary of women in this scale is very much better than in any scale in the colony?—I do not think it advisable to have plums at the top unless you have a good living-wage all through.

988. What do you call a living-wage?—I should think £80 while a girl is young, but that is not enough for an adult woman.

989. You consider the minimum wage is a reasonable one?—Provided it does not go on for too long.

990. Which salaries do you propose to take the money from in order to raise the salaries of women?—I could hardly say. I should think it to be perfectly necessary that when a girl is twenty-five, if she is a good teacher, she should be getting £100 at least.

991. *The Chairman.*] I presume if the salaries were slightly increased you would approve of the scale?—They would need to be considerably increased. From £112 to £95 is a big drop.

992. What is the reduction in your own case?—£13. I am now getting £108. A few years ago it was £112, and it has dropped now to £95.

993. Would the average teacher suffer reduction?—No; there would be a slight rise.

994. Under the proposed scale there would be another assistant?—Not until we reached 175.

995. That would mean an additional £80 a year and two pupil-teachers?—Yes; we have two pupil and two lady teachers in our school.

996. Under the proposed scale the cost of your school would come to about £70 more than at the present time?—I do not think so. We run between 150 and 175 at the present time, and our staff would not alter until we reach 175, which we are not likely to do.

997. Are you in favour of a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes.

998. Do you think it would be an improvement on the present system?—Certainly.

999. Do you consider it is safer in the hands of the Legislature than in the hands of the Boards?—I think in a small colony like New Zealand there should be a colonial scale.

1000. Are you aware if the cost of living is exactly the same in the different districts?—I have always lived in Otago and Canterbury. I should not think it differed much.

1001. You do not know about the West Coast?—No.

1002. It has been urged on us that the cost is much greater in such places as Greymouth, Hokitika, and Nelson?—I should think if a fair living-wage was given to every teacher throughout New Zealand the cost of living would not matter much.

1003. The cost of living would not be a means to attract good teachers away from one part where living is high to another where living is less?—No, I do not think so.

1004. Have you found much difficulty in obtaining teachers when vacancies arise in your school?—No, there are always plenty of teachers to be found so long as the salaries are fairly good.

Miss MENZIES, First Assistant Teacher at West Christchurch School, examined.

Miss Menzies: On behalf of the assistant mistresses of the girls' departments of the city schools, I wish to point out how much more economically the work on the girls' side of the school is carried on than it is on that of the boys. In the school I represent there are three assistant mistresses and a pupil-teacher for the standards from the Second to the Fifth. There is a saving at the Second Standard, the girls being taught by the pupil-teacher, who receives £40 per annum, and the boys by a master at £97 10s., that is, £57 10s. more. The three assistant mistresses teach the Standards III., IV., and V. On the boys' side there are masters doing the same work and with almost the same number of children. The third assistant mistress receives £77 10s.; the third assistant master, £117 10s., £40 more. The second assistant mistress receives £97 10s.; the second assistant master, £167 10s., £70 more. The first assistant mistress gets £122 10s.; the first assistant master, £227 10s., £105 more. On comparing the salaries of the first assistant mistress and the first assistant master, it is felt that the disparity between them is too great, and that in this case especially there is some reason for the complaint that salaries are too far from being equal pay for equal work. The classes taught by these first assistants are the Fifth Standard. They are exactly the same in size, and the mistress teaches her class needlework in addition to the subjects that the two have in common. In the beginning of the circular containing the proposed colonial scale of salaries, we read that an endeavour has been made to increase generally the

salaries paid to women. If, as we gather from the footnote to the scale, the assistant mistresses—first, second, and third—are now to fill the positions indicated in third, fifth, seventh assistant columns, their salaries will be affected as follows: First assistant mistress will be reduced £2 10s., second and third increased by £2 10s. This raises the third assistant mistress's salary to £80. She has taught a large class of Third and sometimes Fourth Standard girls for seven years, and we feel it is very little to be obtaining after all the apprenticeship and training one has undergone in order to become certificated to teach. The assistants in girls' departments have had to qualify themselves to teach the upper standards, and if the higher and harder work is to receive the higher pay they will be glad to receive any increase that the grant will allow. The case of the first assistant mistress especially, the teacher of the Fifth Standard, merits consideration. As I said before, her already small salary is to be decreased by £2 10s.; but the first assistant master, also a Fifth Standard teacher, whose salary at present exceeds hers by £105, has the excess increased to £120.

1005. *Mr. Hill.*] You claim that more should be given to the mistress than is at present paid?—Yes.

1006. Do you think that as much is required from the mistress as from the first assistant master in the school?—I think so.

1007. Do you find the assistant mistresses obtain as good pass-marks generally as the assistant masters?—Yes.

1008. Have you the total number of girls taught by four assistant mistresses in Standard III. upwards, and four assistant masters?—I have not.

1009. I find, in some of the schools, four assistant mistresses and two pupil-teachers take 347 pupils from Standard III. upwards, while four assistant masters take 275 pupils, but the salaries are different. Do you think that is unfair?—I think our salaries ought to be raised.

1010. You think the salaries of the assistants should be more equalised?—Yes.

1011. Do you think the mistress in charge of Standard III. has as difficult work as the mistress in charge of Standard IV.?—No, I do not think so.

1012. There is a distinction between the amount of work they are called upon to do. Under such conditions, would you expect them to receive larger salaries?—Yes.

1013. You teach the Fifth Standard?—Yes.

1014. Is there any other class in the same room with you?—My class occupies the whole room.

1015. Does the master teaching the boys in the Fifth Standard have the same number?—Yes, I think our rolls are the same.

1016. Has he anyone in the room with him?—No.

1017. What is the average number in your class?—There are 67 on the roll. I had 61 present to-day.

1018. You do not remember how many scholars in each of these two standards passed the last examination?—No; I could not say exactly the number.

1019. There would not be much difference?—No.

1020. *Mr. Hogben.*] Are you aware that the proposed scale gives the average in women's salaries an increase of over 12 per cent.?—I did not know until I heard it mentioned here.

1021. Do you think that the £4 capitation will enable a bigger increase to be given to women generally?—I could not say, but it ought to. My salary is going to suffer by it.

1022. I am speaking generally: generally speaking, women's salaries will be as large as you think they are entitled to, taking those figures?—Yes.

1023. The increase in the capitation is 6⅔ per cent., and the increase the proposed scale gives them is over 12 per cent., so they would benefit on the average at least as much as the men. I suppose you approve of the colonial scale generally?—Yes.

1024. Would you like to have a uniform scale—to have as little difference as possible between male and female teachers doing the same work?—Yes.

1025. At the present time you think there is too great a difference?—Yes.

Mrs. Lissaman examined.

Mrs. Lissaman: I wish to say at the outset that I am entirely in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries. I should also like to see a colonial scale of promotion. I do not mean a centralised scale, but I should like to see some definite scheme brought out by means of which teachers in country districts, when their turn comes, should be promoted. It seems to me at the present time promotions are made in a very unsatisfactory manner. I am sure the North Canterbury Board does its utmost to promote teachers as fairly as possible, but in spite of their care a great many injustices do occur. I will quote one case. It was that of a man who, I believe, was appointed to a country school. He is not a friend of mine. You are aware that the system in vogue is that names shall be sent on, and I saw this gentleman's name had been sent on several times, and at last he obtained his appointment. I believe on each occasion his name was put at the top of the list. Now, if the Board considered this gentleman was so well qualified for all the positions he applied for as to put his name each time at the top of the list, why was he not appointed sooner? I do think that the Board is the right body to have the say whether this gentleman or some one else should be appointed, and personally I should like to see the appointment made by the Board direct. I think the Board are the only body of men who are able to do justice to and know a teacher's qualifications. They get their information direct from the Inspectors, and are constantly in touch with each of the teachers; whereas the Committee never comes in touch with the teacher, and we know it is very easy indeed, by means of canvassing, to get to the ears of a Committee, and they very often appoint the wrong person. At any rate, I think the least that might be done to give every one a fair chance would be to insist on the names being

arranged alphabetically. I think that would have a good effect. I think the grounds of promotion should be a teacher's qualifications and the quality of his latest Inspector's report. Now, as to certificates, I well remember the time when the present mode of classification was instituted. There was a great amount of satisfaction felt by teachers that at last certificates were put on what was considered an equitable footing. The teacher was expected then, as now, to pass examinations, and by means of that examination the teacher showed what his scholastic abilities were. We all know that a teacher may be very highly educated, and still be an utter failure as a teacher. On the other hand, a teacher may not be so highly qualified as far as scholastic attainments go, but may have the gift of imparting all that he knows, whereas the first one may not be able to impart 10 per cent. of his knowledge; and, therefore, we were all glad that a teacher's experience and length of service should count equally with his certificate obtained by means of examination. In putting down the class of certificate required to render him eligible for appointment in this proposed scale, I find this matter has been entirely lost sight of, and I would deprecate this very much. For instance, I see in the third group of schools a teacher is required to have a B2 certificate, and yet a C1 would not be accepted in place of it. It seems to me that for the purpose of teaching subjects in our large city schools a C1 certificate is a much better one than a B2, because a No. 1 certificate surely shows a higher amount of experience, and surely the teacher possessing a C certificate must possess all the qualifications necessary to enable him to teach the subjects taught in our large schools. I think the grade should be kept in view; therefore D2 and E1 are almost equal. They are supposed to be equal. In speaking of education, I always keep before me, first of all, the welfare of the children; I think more of them than of the teachers. The teachers have a great many children pass through their hands; but each child has to become a citizen some day, and it is very important he should be considered before any one else. In small country schools, with a small average attendance, I feel sure it would not do to put in charge of a school a teacher with an E5 certificate. Perhaps the people in that district are not entitled to a certificated teacher at all, but it is not their fault there are not more children in the district; and although I do not think children in country schools would receive the same or as good an education as children in the large town schools, I think they should have sent to them a teacher with some experience—in fact, one possessing very special qualifications. This is a case where it should be left entirely to the discretion of the Board to send a teacher. I think at least the teacher should hold an E3 or D4 certificate. They should have some experience as teachers. I think facilities should be given to teachers to visit the larger schools. I know schools in the North Island where this practice largely obtained, with the very best results. Teachers got leave of absence from their Committee for, perhaps, a week, and they saw the better methods in the larger schools, and picked up the best ideas to utilise them for the benefit of their own schools. I do not say they should interfere with the school-work—to be allowed to walk about and ask questions during school hours. They should not be allowed to speak at all, but to sit down or walk about quietly, watching the work, and then, at the end of the day, they might ask as many questions as they liked, and no doubt the teachers in charge of the schools would be pleased to supply them with all the information in their power. At the present time, to do this, one has to spend money. There is the railway fare, and, seeing that our schools are Government schools and our railways Government railways, it is not too much to ask that free passes should be given them on the railway to allow them to come in from Friday night to Monday morning, to attend lectures wherever possible. There is no doubt that when a country teacher is brought in touch with town methods and town people, it improves him mentally and physically, and it must be productive of good in every way. Then I think there should be some uniformity about holidays. I am quite sure any one who has studied the question must acknowledge that a country teacher requires just as many holidays as a town teacher, because he is debarred from any social intercourse; therefore, all he has got to look forward to is his holidays, and I do not think town schools should have more holidays than country schools. Then, as to the syllabus: I think some subjects in the country schools should be optional, and that the syllabus is far too large for a single-handed teacher in some of the country schools. In a single-handed school the teacher may not be able to teach all the subjects equally well. In the towns he could change with some other teacher for that particular subject, but he cannot do so in the country. I think it would be better for the children to receive better education on the more important subjects than have a smattering of each. As to pupil-teachers, I was told that on Friday Mr. Wood said that time should be given to pupil-teachers to study in school hours. I think it is a terrible thing the way young people are filling the graves through being called upon to burn the midnight oil, when other young people are enjoying themselves. I think every pupil-teacher should have at least half a day for study, and the other half for teaching, so they will not have to work more than two hours in the evening at their lessons. Then, about the direct payment of teachers, I give this my most unqualified approval. I was speaking to a chairman the other day, and he told me he never pays the salaries until the middle of the month, and, when I asked why, he said it gave him a better hold over the teachers! I leave you to say whether such power should be placed in the hands of any chairman of a School Committee. Then, as to the minimum wage, I think, for a teacher in sole charge of a school, which is really hard work, the minimum wage should be £100. I have thought this matter out well, and I am quite certain that the minimum wage should be £100. I do not think it right that the Government should be called upon to give this wage for a school having an average attendance of 10 or 12 children, but if they cannot bring up the average to 20 I think the plan suggested—that the children should be taken away by train to the nearest large school—is a very good suggestion, and I should like to see no school kept up at the expense of the Government unless the salary is made up to £100. It would be better to take the money it would cost for this small school towards sending the children to some other centre. Then, as to equal pay for equal work, I know,

of course, very well there is a point where women as they are now, with the difficulties they have to face, do not and cannot do equal work with men; but there is also a point where men, with the advantages they have, cannot do equal work with women, and I say, in the case of the infant mistress, she lays the foundation-stone of the child's future life. Very often school is the only place where the children receive discipline. The whole of the child's life is intrusted to the hands of the infant mistress. She should be a woman of the highest capacity, and her children's good should be more to her than anything else in the world. Do you think you can attract a woman of high qualifications by half-starving her? I think this proposed scale is a disgrace. I think I am saying what is right. Take, for instance, the first assistant in a school. Take the first group: it says first assistant mistress, and below it says, if a master, he shall receive £130, whereas a mistress shall receive £105. As a matter of fact, the first assistant will always be a mistress, so we may strike out that other column, because in a school of that class—a mixed school—the head teacher will always be a master, and this document distinctly states that where the head teacher is a master the first assistant shall be a mistress. I have struck out every one of the columns referring to females, and left those referring to males, and think those are the salaries which should be paid to women. In a small school, with an average attendance of 35, where the mistress here would get £80, I have taken the minimum wage as £100. I say, with a limited number of children, a woman should have from £80 to £90, and so on until she gets to £130. In the second group of figures, where the infant mistress comes in at £105, I would have it rise to £130, and from there to £140 by £5 increments until she reaches £170. I do not think the first assistant master, in a school with an average attendance of 250, should receive more than the infant mistress, because the infant mistress has to train a teacher, and she is responsible for the moral wellbeing of the school. The other teachers will be her juniors, and she has to render them assistance. She has the training of more pupil-teachers than any other teacher in the school, because they all pass through her hands in the first place. I have just one word to say in reference to Miss Glanville's remarks. I, and I think nearly every lady teacher here, disagree with what she said: that it is very difficult to get competent mistresses to do the work of teaching large standards. We cannot think that women are so incompetent as that. I do not think it. I think there must be plenty of women teachers if they were advertised for, and I believe women are quite as well able to manage children as men, especially in a mixed class, if the boys do not predominate. As far as city schools are concerned, although I have never been in charge of a city school, I think it is a great mistake that every one is so opposed to mixing boys and girls. The boys and girls have to live together in the world. Boys should be trained to respect women, and girls should be taught to respect themselves, and I think school is the place to acquire these traits.

1026. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you think this chivalry is increasing among the boys?—To some extent. It depends upon the personality of the teacher more than anything else.

1027. Do you think the boys are improving in their respect for women and elderly people?—Yes.

1028. How many years have you been engaged in school-work?—It is about twenty-three years ago since I first taught, but six years of that time I was not teaching.

1029. Do you think boys have as much respect now for their teachers as when you started?—Yes; I have never had any trouble in a school of big boys. They have always treated me with the greatest courtesy and respect.

1030. You say small schools should have the salary made up by the parents. Would not that involve a great hardship upon numbers of those parents?—At first sight it appears so, but I have lived in the country, and I say it is in some cases, where the average attendance is small, the fault of the parents, because they keep the children away on the most trivial excuses, and if they had to put their hands in their pockets they would not do so.

1031. There are many parts in Nelson and West Coast where the families are very few: what would you do in their case?—I would give them a capitation of £5, and the teacher they would have would practically be a governess.

1032. I understood you to say you thought Boards should appoint teachers, and not Committees?—Yes; in every case, I think, we are better in the hands of the Education Board.

1033. If it were not done, you would wish to insist that canvassing should be discontinued?—Yes.

1034. You consider the Boards are better qualified to appoint teachers than the Government?—Yes, they know all about the teachers.

1035. You would like free passes issued from Friday night to Monday morning?—Yes.

1036. *Mr. Luke.*] Is it really the fact that the Committees take the salaries of the teachers and hold them as long as they think proper before giving it to the teacher?—Yes, I could give you several instances.

1037. In what education district?—In North Canterbury. It is the only one where the system obtains.

1038. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] I think you said it would be better if the selection of candidates were made by the Board instead of School Committees. Would you be surprised to learn that in at least one educational district in New Zealand where the Board has selected the teachers the system has not worked at all satisfactorily?—I should be surprised to hear that.

1039. Again, supposing the Committee had no voice in the selection of a teacher, and the teacher was forced on the district, and he was distasteful to the Committee, in the event of the Committee having the power of holding the teachers' salary until the middle or end of the month, would not that be a hardship?—I want to see that done away with.

1040. Do the teachers not make representations to the Board on the subject?—I think it was brought up once.

1041. With regard to certificates, do you consider that you should have examinations for teachers' certificates altogether independent of university examinations?—I do not think it matters much whether you are examined in one way or the other. I should think that the subjects you are examined in matter more.

1042. Do you see any objection to taking Class D through matriculation examination?—I have been told it is easier to get it that way.

1043. Would you favour a uniformity of pupil-teachers' examinations throughout the colony?—Yes.

1044. I believe you have a system in North Canterbury of employing monitors in some schools and giving them no salary at all?—We have not got the system to any extent.

1045. Do the monitors expect the Board to pay them?—I do not think the Board knows anything about them being employed.

1046. Do you not realise the fact that it is very difficult indeed to draw up any scale to meet each individual case?—Yes, because I have sat down and attempted it myself.

1047. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you not think the lowering of the work in the schools in the country would tend to make it more difficult for teachers in the country to obtain promotion in the town?—I do not think it would lower the work of the standards, but simply make the syllabus less.

1048. Would they not be looked upon as doing lower work in consequence?—I think not.

1049. You say that no school should be established, in your opinion, unless the teacher could get £100 salary?—That is, the sole charge of that school.

1050. Would that include small schools where there are only half a dozen children?—I have said I would like to see that school done away with.

1051. What would you suggest as a capitation allowance?—£5 towards the maintenance of the school.

1052. *Mr. Weston.*] The employment of monitors, I think, is preliminary to their appointment as pupil-teachers?—They are the coming pupil-teachers.

1053. In reference to the withholding of salary, do you blame the Board?—No.

1054. *Mr. Hogben.*] Are you aware that the average salaries of men in New Zealand for all occupations are two and three-quarter times the average of women?—I am aware men are better paid than women, but I do not know to what extent.

1055. The average salary of a man is £92 12s., the average of a woman £33 18s. per year; so the average salary is as 273 is to 100. The number of male wage-earners is rather more than four times the number of women wage-earners. Do you propose to bring down the salaries of the males?—No; but if I were a gentleman of the Commission, and I felt that with £4 per head capitation justice could not be done, I would throw up the work rather than do injustice to the women. I would throw the onus on the Government and say, "You must increase the capitation." I know you would do more if you had the means at your disposal, but I think the country can stand the strain of an additional advance being made for education. In order to pay equal salaries to men and women an additional grant should be made.

1056. Where is the money to come from?—The money will come easily enough, because money is always the fruit of anybody's labour.

1057. *The Chairman.*] From what you say, I take you to mean that money, like water, will gravitate to a common level?—Yes.

1058. You do not agree that the average value of male labour is nearly three times as large as the value of female labour?—No. Because other people do wrong, it is no excuse for us to do wrong.

1059. I take it from your remarks that you want to rectify what you consider a gross abuse?—Yes.

1060. You think the minimum wage allowed in the scale is somewhat small?—I think it should be £100. I think that is little enough.

1061. *Mr. Hogben.*] The result of this scale has reduced the difference between the average salaries of men and women?—I think that a woman should not be paid a less rate because she does not happen to be a man.

Miss Glanville.

Miss Glanville: Mrs. Lissaman just now said that it was understood that I said there were not a suitable number of candidates to fill the position of first assistant mistress in a suburban school, and that the work was not within the scope of a woman's labour. I did not wish to state such a thing at all. I was misunderstood. I believe there are always a great number of candidates for a position of the kind, and I know the work has been well done by the first assistant mistresses. They have taught these large Fourth Standards with good results for many years, so the work is within the scope of a woman's labour. What I wanted to point out was that so few candidates are considered by the Board or Inspectors as suitable for such a position, and that the work is harder, and therefore should be well paid.

Mr. Morris, Chairman of the West Christchurch School Committee, examined.

Mr. Morris: I have come before the Commission simply to enter my protest against any proposed cutting-down of the fund for incidental expenses. We find at the particular school I represent that the amount we have had at our disposal is in several respects too small altogether. I know you will say that the amount expended in other centres is smaller than we are granted here, but I do not know what the conditions may be in Auckland and Dunedin. I know that in the case of West Christchurch the amount we have is far below that necessary. I hope that in any scheme you may bring forward you will not contemplate cutting down the amount. I shall be pleased to give any particulars as to how the money is expended, to prove there is no reckless extravagance.

1062. *Mr. Weston.*] What do you pay your caretaker?—£90 a year.

1063. Is his time fully occupied?—Yes. The average amount we have had has been about £180 a year, and out of that we have had to spend £90 for caretaker, and then the coal bill comes to £30 or £40, and we have to pay all the repairs on the building. We have to do a good deal outside of that. There is the bath to put in order, and we have had to come to the Board for assistance. I shall be pleased to have a return made of the expenditure, and forwarded to the Commission.

Mr. ROWLEY, First Assistant at the West Christchurch School, examined.

Mr. Rowley: I wish to point out on behalf of the first assistant masters of city schools in North Canterbury that the proposed scale will cause us, if put into effect, very considerable reduction. We have already been reduced in times past, and this means still further reduction. Before the 1900 scale came into force we had £240 a year, and, except in one case, we had an allowance for pupil-teachers of from £16 to £32. After the reduction our salaries went down to from £227 10s. to £232, *plus* the pupil-teacher allowance, which was still higher than the £240 which the proposed scale allows us. But when there was added to the amount that the reduced scale gave us £15 out of the special 5s. capitation grant for that purpose, we then received from £258 10s. up to £282. Mr Hogben's scale reduces us to £240, a very considerable reduction. We claim that £240 is not enough, and for this reason: In the first place, the proposed scale gives £220 to an assistant master in a school of from 570 to 600 children, where the required certificate is D3. When we get to a school of 700 the salary is £240, but we have to have a B2 certificate, two certificates and a grade higher, and we have to teach 20 per cent. longer hours on account of teaching pupil-teachers; besides that, the school being larger, we have more responsibility. Then compare the second master's salary with the headmaster's. This is from £356 to £391, and the assistant master's is from £116 to £151 less than that. I wish to state that we have not the slightest wish to reduce the headmaster's salary, but we wish to show that ours are too low. We feel that there must be prizes in the profession, and that the headmaster's salary is none too high. Still we think there is too large a difference between his salary and ours, considering that we have to be competent to take his place. Then we are supposed to hold about the same qualifications as the headmasters of schools of from 250 to 600, where the certificate required is C1. Their salaries are between £289 and £337, and if the requirements are just the same why should there be so much difference between the salaries? Compared with headmasters getting similar salaries we rank with masters in schools of from 81 to 115, staffed in the first case with master, mistress, and pupil-teacher, or 27 children per teacher, and in the second case (115) with master, mistress, and two pupil-teachers, or 29 children per teacher. The certificate required is D1, and even that is complained of as too high. We require to have a B2 certificate.

1064. *Mr. Davidson.*] How many teachers in the colony are qualified as B1?—I could not tell you.

Mr. Hogben: I can easily get you a return.

1065. *Mr. Hill.*] Did I understand you to say that the headmaster gets £390?—The highest salary possible is £391.

1066. In the Board's scale it is down as £325. What do you think of a scheme of arranging schools into a number of classes, and so arranging the staff that the first assistant master in a first-class school should receive equal salary with a master in a third-class school?—That would depend very much upon the classes. I should like to have definite figures to show the classes.

1067. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Is your salary £240 a year?—My present salary is £258 10s.

1068. What would be the salary of the first assistant mistress in the same school?—£122 10s.

1069. Do you reckon yourself on a level with the first assistant mistress?—There is the headmaster, and then comes the headmistress. I am first in rank on the boys' side, and equal with the headmistress.

1070. *Mr. Weston.*] In the suggested scale the headmistress would rank equal with you?—I think Mr. Lethbridge was ranking me with the first assistant mistress, and I ranked myself rather with the headmistress as being the first on the boys' side under the headmaster, while she is first under the headmaster on the girls' side.

1071. What salary would you get under the proposed scale?—£240; less by £18 10s. than I am getting now.

1072. What chance has the first assistant for promotion?—We do hear of first assistant masters being promoted, but the chances are so infrequent that it is hard to say. Some have got positions as headmasters.

1073. So that practically the first assistant may be reckoned as a man not likely to receive more pay?—I do not think that exactly follows. I do not think we are completely barred from promotion.

1074. I think you said that the chances of promotion would be very infrequent: then, it would naturally follow that the chances are in favour of the first assistant remaining in that position?—Yes, because headmasters in suburban schools very seldom leave their positions.

1075. *Mr. Hogben.*] Your salary is £240 in the proposed scale: what is it under the North Canterbury Board scale?—£227 10s.

1076. This proposed scale gives you £240; but for the pupil-teacher remuneration this would give you an increase of £12 10s.?—My present salary is based on a lower capitation. You propose distributing the money on a £4 capitation grant. The other one is on a £3 15s. capitation. We expect to get a fair increase.

1077. You will get the £12 10s.?—Yes; but lose £16 for instruction of pupil-teachers.

1078. Your salary by the scale is £227 10s. You get an increase of £12 10s., according to this scale. With regard to additional allowance, is it a rule of the Board you are to receive £16 allowance for pupil-teachers?—If we do the work we get the money.

1079. Do all the first assistants get this?—Wherever there are pupil-teachers in the city schools.

1080. *The Chairman.*] I understand your complaint is that there is too great a difference between the salaries paid to the first assistant and the headmaster?—Yes.

1081. Is there much difference in the work of the headmaster and the first assistant?—The work is of an entirely different nature.

1082. Is it as arduous in one case as the other?—I should think the work of the assistant master was more arduous, but less responsible.

1083. Do you think the first assistant master is usually capable of performing the duties of a headmaster?—Yes; and by the Inspector's marks given us, we are.

1084. Do you think it fair and reasonable that a headmaster should have house allowance of £50 a year: should not the assistant be treated in a similar way?—House allowance is just a matter of salary. If you mean it is proposed to add £50 a year for house allowance to my salary I should be very pleased to hear it.

1085. But do you think if one teacher had house allowance the others should have similar provision made?—Not exactly. It depends entirely upon the amount of salary.

1086. I think you said the relative salaries were too unequal?—Yes; and the house allowance makes them still more unequal.

1087. Do not you think house allowance ought to be included in salary?—I do not see it makes much difference.

1088. In the annual report of the Education Board, is the house allowance set forth there so that any one can understand it?—No.

1089. Is it not wrapped up in such a way that it is impossible to find out what is meant?—Yes.

Mr. Lane, Secretary to the North Canterbury Board.

Mr. Lane: When the Commission sat on Friday morning I was not prepared with any statement on behalf of the Board, but during the inquiry matters have come up affecting different points, and with your permission I shall submit a statement through the Chairman of the Board. There is one point which has not been mentioned at all, regarding the staffing of infant-schools. That has not been touched upon, and the proposed scale does not deal with it, and I would ask the Inspector-General to give it his attention. We have three schools, one at Ashburton (side-school), Phillipstown, and St. Albans (side-school). The first has an average of 72 up to Standard III., the second an average of 222 up to Standard II., and the third, St. Albans, has an average of 101 up to Standard III. It is quite clear that some special provision will have to be made in regard to those schools, which are being taught on a different footing.

DUNEDIN.

Thursday, 16th May, 1901.

Rev. P. B. Fraser, M.A., Member of the Otago Education Board, examined.

Mr. Fraser: I feel at the moment, owing to the presentation by the Inspector-General of this new scale, that those of us who come with minds made up on the previous scale are somewhat taken aback, because not only have we considered it as far as it would affect the smaller schools, but we have had to consider the wider issues of how far the use of the education grant in this way would absorb the funds that the colony gives for education generally; and I feel, however wise it may be to introduce this second alternative scheme, that it is likely to confuse the evidence, because we have been considering this first scale from a provincial and a colonial point of view for some time. The first matter, however, that I would like to bring forward is with regard to the colonial scale generally—whether it is desirable that a colonial scale should be made. The official mind delights in pigeon-holes and red tape, and in having everything so arranged that it may be dovetailed into a particular scheme. But colonial life and life in the country cannot always be fitted into pigeon-holes, and I fail to see that there is anything to be gained for education in this colony by merely a colonial scale. It is attractive to the mind to have a colonial scale, especially when you hold up the small provinces, and say these are unjustly treated, and make them a lever for a colonial scale. I submit that the old scheme of paying to the Boards is more adapted to colonial needs. All Parliament did was to give funds to the various provinces, and allow the provinces to work out their own salvation. This is, comparatively as to population, a small province, and a small community as yet; but by-and-by there will be millions of people in the colony, and it will be a great advantage to have educational experiments going on simultaneously in the various provinces. With your permission, I would like to read a short passage from John Stuart Mill on "Liberty." He says, "A general State education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another; and, as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in the Government—whether this be a monarchy, a priesthood, an aristocracy, or a majority of the existing generation—in proportion as it is efficient and successful it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by natural tendency to one over the body." And further on he says, "Government operations tend to be everywhere alike. With individuals and voluntary associations, on the contrary, there are varied experiments and endless diversity of experience. What the State can usefully do is to make itself a central depository, and active circulator and diffuser, of the experience resulting from many trials. Its business is to enable each experimentalist to benefit by the experiments of others, instead of tolerating no experiments but its own." Now, this is what I conceive to be the function of the central department: to be a circulator and a diffuser of the latest educational knowledge, and to enable each Board to benefit by the experience

of the others, rather than that the department should tolerate no experiments but its own. If there is any scheme which the Inspector-General or the department has worked out, these have been enabled to do so by the various past experiences of the Boards. But wipe out the provincial Boards and in ten years where would the experience be to learn from? There would be none but that of the central department. We may be only getting rid of some evils to contract far more. What I think would be sufficient for present needs, and at the same time would have preserved provincial control, would be for the department to have granted to the smaller Education Boards a proper sum; then it could have seen that the salaries were raised in these districts to an adequate scale. I have a table here showing what is the average cost in this Board of certain schools per pupil. For schools under an average attendance of 20 the average cost is £5 11s. 3d.; from 20 to 25, £4 12s. 9d.; from 26 to 50, £4 14s. 6d.; from 51 to 110, £4 8s. 2d.; from 111 to 150, £3 6s. 6d.; from 151 to 180, £2 18s. 6d.; from 181 to 750 the cost ranges from £2 15s. 9d. to £2 14s. 10d. That includes teachers' salaries and Committees' grants. Now, considering that fact, what I should have suggested is this: that the Government, instead of granting all over the colony £3 15s. (and now £4) for every pupil in average attendance, no matter where educated, it should have said, "We shall grant to schools with an average attendance of below 100 or below 51 £5 or £6 per head, and over that we will still give £3 15s." That would have done justice to small provinces. It would have enabled them to provide the same amount of education as the larger provinces are able to do. I suggest that simple remark at the outset as against any colonial scale. That the teachers have agitated is not to be wondered at, for it is their business to see that they are properly paid; but I submit it is also the business of the Education Board and the Government to see that the money is at the same time spent in the best interests of education. An illustration occurs to my mind. If your business is simply to get by rail from St. Petersburg to Moscow, a straight line by order of the Czar will get you there; and if you simply want to raise salaries, without other considerations, then the easiest way to do it is by a "colonial" scale. The only thing that would justify a colonial scale at all at the present time would be that the department should provide a superannuation scheme along with it. I consider that it will be a misfortune for teachers themselves, and will involve the country sooner or later in excessive expense, or break down the scheme, if this colonial scale is adopted before a scheme of superannuation is also provided. Some time ago I made inquiries in all the colonies to find if there was anything of the kind at present in existence. The South Australian department, I found, had such a scheme, in which they provide retiring-allowances and annuities ranging from £52 to £140 for male teachers, and from £39 to £73 for female teachers. It is easy to make a colonial scale if you put aside the things that stand in the way. Then, another point that is left out, and admittedly left out, is the question dealing with the payment for pupil-teachers. I call your attention to the care which the Home department devotes to the training of pupil-teachers. The syllabus and the Inspectors and the department are nothing compared with the quality of our teachers. You can put a good teacher into the country and never have a department or an Inspector in existence, and education will go on without them; but you can have an Education Department without any education going on at all. The essential thing is the training and quality of our teachers, and if you take away from the headmaster the payment for the extra work which is necessitated in giving the pupil-teacher proper tuition he is not under any obligation to be any more careful with his pupil-teacher than with the tuition of other pupils in his school. Now, with regard to the question of equal pay for male and female teachers, there is nothing more irrational than such a plea. The whole thing turns on what you mean by "work." The work of a man or woman in a community is not settled by having taught in a school for five or six hours a day. Civilised communities expect that a man should be married and bring up a family; and we do not expect that a woman should, as a rule, have a family dependent on her labours. I submit that the contention that men and women should be paid equally is a most selfish suggestion. Every one will admit that a person must have a living wage, and that a woman should have a satisfactory salary, but that she should receive equal pay to a man is a proposal detrimental to the community and to the teachers. I am not going over the whole of the various points of the scheme, but I have taken a strong interest in the matter of country schools. Our province for a number of years past has dealt, in my opinion, most unjustly with the country, and the effect has been to starve the education of the country. The scale that has been adopted went on the lines of this one that is now proposed. It made numbers the sole factor in settling the salary. But in a community where the vast number of schools are small country schools, and only a few large ones are in the towns, there should be a cleavage between the two. Instead of a scheme that simply went from 1,000 down to 15, there should be one scale for the country schools and another scale for the town schools, and they should work out separately. The system that has hitherto been adopted has had the effect of killing our education in the country. We have had that constantly brought before us, and it was brought before the Board yesterday. Advertisements had been put in the Press calling for applicants for positions in four country schools, of which the salary is £70. For these four vacancies only two girls applied. If you have an advertisement for a town position at £85 you have half of the country teachers applying for it. We have had as many as fifty applicants for positions in town schools at £85, and we cannot get teachers to apply for small country schools. These teachers applying for such schools have no experience of teaching at all, and they are sent out to engineer the education of a whole district. In some counties you will find that there is not one large school. In our Board here we have 220 schools. The County of Waitaki has twenty-six schools; fourteen of these are fifth-class schools, eleven are taught by two teachers, and there is just one school with three teachers. The result, so far as getting scholarships is concerned, is that during the last ten years only five scholarships went to the country schools of that whole county. Then, in Waihemo County there are seven schools. Five of these are under 31 pupils, one is under 51, and there is

just one third-class school; and not a single scholarship went to that county in ten years. In Waikouaiti there are sixteen schools, of which eight are under 31, five under 101—that is, thirteen out of the sixteen are fourth-class schools. In ten years Waikouaiti gained thirteen scholarships. In Peninsula County there are ten schools, six of them being fifth class, and just one school with three teachers. In ten years only three scholarships were gained in that county. In the Taieri County there are twenty-three schools, fifteen of which are fifth class, five have two teachers, two have three teachers, and one is a third-class school. These twenty-three schools in ten years only gained two scholarships, and not one for the last eight years. The County of Bruce has twenty-two schools, sixteen of which are fifth class, and in ten years only fourteen scholarships have fallen to the schools of this district. Tuapeka has twenty-five schools; nineteen of these are fifth class with one teacher, and four have two teachers, and they gained seven scholarships in ten years. In Vincent County there are twenty-one schools, sixteen of which are fifth class, and no school is higher than fourth class, and only three scholarships have been gained in ten years. Then we have the County of Maniototo—the last one I will give you: Out of the sixteen schools in that county, fifteen are fifth-class schools, and there is just one fourth-class school in the whole county. These schools have only gained two scholarships in ten years, although the population is four thousand. Hitherto nothing but the rawest material has been sent to the small country schools, and the result is shown in what I have just submitted to you. In the town (excluding three smaller suburban schools) there are seventeen schools in all. The Dunedin schools in ten years have taken fifty-nine scholarships, or, with Oamaru, sixty-three scholarships out of a total of 119. Of these fifty-nine scholarships, the Normal School, which is immediately under the control of the Education Board, has taken twenty-four, exactly the number awarded in ten years to seven counties comprising 139 schools. That is, the Dunedin schools, with an average attendance of 3,445 children at the date of my calculation, have taken fifty-nine scholarships, leaving just sixty for all other schools in the province, with 14,303 children. One scholarship goes to every fifty-seven Dunedin children, and one to every other 238 children of the province. What I have been endeavouring to show is that the present system kills education throughout the country. You ought to treat the country separately, and staff the schools with teachers of good calibre, so that the pupils going through their hands may be fairly able to compete with the children going to the town schools. We might have made a competition amongst these country schools by which more scholarships would have gone to the country; but that would not have shown that the quality of the education there is as substantial as it is here in the towns. I submit that in the case of this examination, where the children of the country compete against the children of the town, it has been shown that the education in the country is not the same as in the town. Take this point in connection with the large towns schools. You pay a head-teacher, a first assistant, and a mistress very high salaries, and a pupil entering that school has the benefit of the quality and calibre of those teachers' professional work; whereas the child in the country has his whole education imparted to him by a teacher receiving a salary of £70 per year. Then, as to the question of the size of the classes in the town schools, I think you ought to make a limit to the size of the classes. Some of the classes in which lady teachers have to teach are simply sending them to the lunatic asylum or the grave. A lady teacher is put in charge of a Fourth Standard with 80 or 90, or more, pupils, and you ought to make a maximum for each class, and not allow any more children of that class to go to that school. I suggest that some provision ought to be made in this matter in staffing town schools by which such slaving work would be prevented from being brought on the teachers. I would like to mention another matter in connection with country schools. In the scale, the classification you submit for country schools is D5 and E2. For the majority of these schools the classification is only D2. You ought to wipe out the E certificate altogether. The mere passing of the E examination is not in itself adequate to justify putting such a teacher in sole charge of a school. Some attention ought to be given to the Scholarship Fund also, and provision made for the further educating of our brightest children. There are undoubtedly great advantages from the suggested increase of the salaries of country teachers, as given in the new scale submitted this morning. I think the Commission ought to remember that the headmasters have a house allowance or a free house, and instead of attempting to bring down the salaries of the assistants they should be raised. In many cases it is the assistants who are doing the hardest work. Another advantage of the proposed scheme is that it increases the cost *per capita*, and that it would prevent the Board diverting to other uses the funds available for teachers' salaries. The teachers are entirely justified in doing anything they can to prevent their salaries being retrenched for other purposes. I speak as taking an interest in the matter, that this Board's funds have gone too much in the payment of Inspectors and officials of the Board, and the result has been that the salaries have had to be curtailed in these country schools. I do not mean that our Inspectors are individually overpaid, but I submit that we have too many, and that money would be saved by having one or two Chief Inspectors for each Island, and Assistant Inspectors, and that the Inspectors should be relieved altogether from being individually held responsible to members of the Board.

1. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You are in favour of first assistants being paid the same as now?—Yes, certainly.

2. In dealing with the allowances to small schools you suggest that they should get £5 or £6, and that £3 15s. be provided for schools over 50?—Yes; the scheme submitted to-day is practically the same as I submitted to the Board some time ago, and I place before the Commission a copy [Exhibit 51].

3. You are in favour of a superannuation scheme?—Yes, very strongly.

4. On the same lines as the South Australian scheme?—I would not say that.

5. Regarding the disparity in applications for town and country schools, do you suggest the rate of salaries that should be attached to country schools?—I would be satisfied with such

salaries as are suggested in the amended scale. It will turn the drift of teachers from the town to the country.

6. Do you really think that that will cause teachers of sufficiently high calibre to be attracted to and content with country schools, and that more scholarships will go to country schools?—I have not minutely examined that point, but I believe it would, with an alteration in our scholarships regulations.

7. Would you consider the E certificate sufficiently good for the present 25-pupil school?—I think the time has long passed when E should be regarded as a sufficient certificate. Education is so easily got, and there are so many teachers who have D certificates, that certificates should not be granted for a lower qualification.

8. *Mr. Davidson.*] You object to the centralisation tendency as being likely to bring about a uniformity not desirable?—Yes, strongly.

9. You do not think, I understand, that the adoption of a colonial scale of salary would have that effect?—Not necessarily.

10. Under any scheme of capitation grant there would necessarily be a very considerable difference in the rate of pay in different educational districts?—Not if the different districts were compelled to submit their scale to the central department or a central Board, to which teachers could appeal in order to see whether the arrangement was equitable.

11. Do you think it would be much easier to have a superannuation scheme if we had a colonial scale?—Yes, certainly; that would be the justification of the colonial scale.

12. In your opinion, then, it would be easier to formulate a superannuation scheme when we had got a colonial scale of salary than under the present system?—I think you could not grapple with it except at the time of formulating a colonial scale.

13. If we had a colonial scale the difficulties of bringing in a superannuation scheme would not be so great?—Probably.

14. Do you know if in any of the Australasian Colonies at the present time payment for instruction to pupil-teachers is granted to headmasters?—I could not say; but, even if it were not the case, there may be circumstances and regulations by which they do see that the pupil-teachers are being taught.

15. I understand you are not in favour of equal pay to women and to men for equal work?—Not to the principle itself.

16. You would be strongly in favour, though, of reducing the great disparity now paid to some of the schools in some of our provincial districts?—Yes, where the female salaries are too low, but quite irrespective of equal pay for equal work.

17. In submitting the table showing number of scholarships gained by the country districts and the Towns of Dunedin and Oamaru, do you not think the comparison would be fairer if the number of scholarships gained by the children above the Fourth Standard were compared with the number of scholarships obtained by children above the Fourth Standard in the cities?—I cannot see what the difference would be.

18. Scholarships are usually gained by pupils from the Fifth and Sixth Standards?—Certainly.

19. If the number of pupils in the country districts above the Fourth Standard is very nearly equal to the number in the cities, would it not be fairer to compare the number of scholarships gained by children above the Fourth Standard with the number in similar standards in the cities?—No; if you take the gross number I think it is a fair thing.

20. In showing the number of scholarships gained by the city scholars you pointed out that one school in particular had gained a very large number of scholarships: would it not be fair to point out the very large number of Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Standard pupils in that school as compared with the other city schools?—Yes; but that only shows that the greater number of children are attracted there by reason of the increased calibre of the teachers engaged in that school.

21. Have you ever made a comparison of the number of scholarships gained by country schools since the allowance of one year in age was made to the country children?—This return I have prepared is for ten years, and includes the time that that allowance has been in force.

22. Do you think so much is due to the calibre of the teacher as to the indifference of the teacher or the parents in the country to children going up for scholarships?—Those elements are both there, but it is mainly due to the large amount of work put on the teacher in the country in the conduct of his school.

23. In your opinion, is there sufficient provision made in the colony at the present time for the proper training of teachers?—No.

24. *Mr. Stewart.*] Are you the elected representative of the Otago Education Board?—The Board elected three representatives last night, and I am one of the three, but whether or not in what I have said I am speaking for the Board I cannot say. I am not binding the individual members of the Board by what I have said.

25. You said you do not consider it is quite a wise thing that the colonial scale of staffs and salaries should be drawn up, but further on in your evidence you said that you would propose that each Board should draw up its own scale, and then submit the scale to the central department?—I am not opposed to a colonial scale as such, but I am opposed to a colonial scale that does not provide for all the factors.

26. Do you wish the Commission to understand that you are in favour of a colonial scale drawn up by the department, or a scale drawn up by the Board of Education and finally submitted to the department?—I belive that if our province got the money that is available, and was compelled to submit its scale of staffs and salaries to the department or a central Board, the scale would be probably worked out better; and a few years after this it will be found how the different provinces succeed, and one province of the colony would learn from the experience of the whole.

27. As a matter of fact, is not the Commission at the present time benefiting by the different scales that have been at work throughout the colony?—Yes.

28. Then, we have arrived at the point where that experience can be crystallized?—That is a question which I am not able to answer. That question can only be put to a member of the Commission after he has heard all the evidence.

29. You read a quotation from John Stuart Mill, and put a construction on it in opposition to a colonial scale: how does a colonial scale mould the mind of a colony?—The general statement of Mill was against centralisation, and having one experiment made in the country, instead of two or three, from which lessons might be drawn for the benefit of all.

30. But how can questions of finance mould the mind in the matter of education?—I have shown how that is done in the results of education in this province. Finance is the lever that affects the whole thing.

31. You state that the Boards had seized the funds intended to provide for the salaries of teachers. Now, may I not ask you this: do you not think that under such circumstances it is a wise thing that we should have a colonial scale, so that that sort of thing should not obtain?—That is what has properly justified the teachers' demand that something should be done; but that can be accomplished by ear-marking the funds of each Board, and not allowing a penny of the money to go for Inspectors, office-work, buildings, or anything else other than the payment of teachers' salaries.

32. If each individual Board is going to draw up its own scale, what guarantee would there be that each Board throughout the colony for the same work would allot the same rate of pay?—There would be the guarantee that each Board would be just as likely to have the same wisdom as a central department.

33. Against that contention, does not this fact weigh: that the different Boards of the colony at the present time hardly agree in the rates of payment?—That goes without saying, because they have not the funds. The small provinces have been starved.

34. Take the case of Canterbury and Otago—where you cannot say that only up to a very recent time they have been troubled for money: have those two provinces adopted anything like approximate scales?—I cannot say that they have.

35. Would they be likely to in the future?—If under compulsion of being brought to compare notes with the central department.

36. What difference would there really be if the central Board should have the chief power to draw up the scale?—All the difference in the world, seeing that this matter would be initiated by the Boards themselves in the one case, and in the other case it would be initiated by the central department.

37. In the start of your evidence you said you would advise that this should obtain: that one rate of capitation should be devoted to one class of schools, and another capitation to a second class of schools, the capitation to range from £3 15s. to £6?—Only two capitations.

38. If the Commission thought wise to recommend such a proposal to the Government, do you think or do you not think that the tendency of offering a larger capitation to the smaller-sized schools would result in a vast number of small schools being built up all over the colony?—I do not think that would be so. It is a common suggestion on the part of teachers that if you multiply schools there is a tendency to take away funds that should otherwise be devoted to salaries. But, again, if there is exercised reasonable control to prevent the multiplicity of small schools they will be provided for.

39. Who will exercise that control—the central department?—Yes, I think so.

40. Do you not think that if you had such control with regard to the multiplicity of such small schools, and such control with regard to the rates of salaries, there would be constant friction between the department and the Boards?—I cannot say. It depends on whether there are sensible men in both departments.

41. Are you in favour of payment by results?—I am in favour of this: that where a master has pupil-teachers, and teaches them outside of school-time, he should be paid for so teaching them.

42. Would you pay the teacher whether the pupil-teachers passed their examinations or not?—Yes, certainly.

43. Would there then be the same incentive for the teacher to give instruction to the pupil-teachers in that case?—When you pay a man deliberately for a particular thing you will expect him to do it.

44. If the payment is lumped with the salary, you do not think that that would have the same effect as if it was made a separate payment for the instruction of the pupil-teachers?—No, because then you might have men with equal salaries, and one doing extra work, but still getting the same salary as the man who was doing nothing extra.

45. Do you think that the matter of the number of applicants for country schools and town schools is a question of money?—Yes; and I think it is one of the things against a colonial scale, for the outlying parts of provinces require almost to have a special salary attached to them.

46. You infer that position has got something to do with it?—Yes.

47. Then, money has not got all to do with it?—It is a question of money, for money overcomes the drawbacks of position.

48. You spoke of the size of the classes in the town schools, and the very serious difficulties of the lady teachers connected therewith: which do you think is the hardest strain—a lady teacher put in sole charge of a school of 36 to 40, or put in charge of a large town class of, say, 65, which is a comparatively low average?—I should think that the lady teacher in charge of a school of an average attendance of 30 would have harder work. If the town class had only an average attendance of 60—that I do not think an excess at all—I think that the country teacher has work of more responsibility.

49. Which do you think has the largest nervous strain?—The mistress in sole charge of the school.

50. You think that the proposals, if carried out, would have the effect of benefiting the small schools in Otago?—It would enormously benefit them.

51. And in consequence you are prepared to support the adoption of such a scale as this?—No; I say give this extra 5s. to the Board, and we will pay the teachers as much as you propose to do by that scale.

52. *Mr. Luke.*] What is the value of the senior and junior scholarships here?—They vary according to the situation of the pupil. £15 a year for pupils who live in the district in which the school is that they attend, and £35 a year if they attend a school away from home. The senior scholarship is £40 if they reside away from home.

53. Would the scholarship regulations of the Auckland Board suit Otago?—Yes, they would be a great advantage.

54. Does the Otago Education Board ever use the Salary Fund for building purposes?—Speaking as a member of the Board, I may say I am kept very largely in the dark as to the Board's finance.

55. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How many schools are there in the Otago District?—222.

56. How many of those have an average attendance of less than 50?—142.

57. You will admit that 142 is about two-thirds of the total number of schools?—Yes.

58. And consequently should receive every consideration at the hands of the Commission, the Board, and the department?—Certainly; but not by doing injustice to the others. I am simply pleading for adequate treatment for all.

59. You do not believe in reducing the salaries of those teachers above the scale in order to increase the salaries of those who are receiving remuneration now below the scale?—I simply divide the money adequately and fairly.

60. Is considerable pressure brought to bear on the Board ever to start aided schools?—There is pressure, but the pressure is next to nothing compared to what they are able to exert in town for much less necessary requirements.

61. You seem to favour provincialism rather than centralisation?—I do not favour provincialism in a bad sense. I am in favour of the provinces managing their own affairs, and that is not necessarily parochialism.

62. You do not think that what you suggest would diminish the control of the Education Boards?—It all depends on the nature of the scheme that is finally brought in. I am not opposed to any scale that is for the benefit of the education of the colony.

63. Do you wish us to infer that the number of the scholarships that are gained by a school is proof positive of the efficiency of that school?—I was careful to say that that was not so; it is, however, a factor showing the quality of the teacher.

64. In computing your table did you take into consideration the number of candidates that had gone up from the country schools and failed in the scholarship examinations? Is it not a fact that many schools have no pupils going up at all?—That proves that there are none capable of going up.

65. Would it not be better if your Board adopted a scheme of having one set of scholarships for country candidates and one set for town?—Yes; that is what I have been agitating for for some time.

66. Do you find it your experience that teachers as a whole are inadequately paid for the services they render?—Teachers of the smaller country schools in Otago under the first scale are most inadequately paid for the work they give.

67. Do you find that a number of the teachers are leaving the professsion in Otago to go into other avocations where they are more adequately paid?—It is not a matter of remuneration entirely; it is the uncertainty of promotion in the profession that is causing the dissatisfaction.

68. You have a large number of applications, have you not, even for the poorly paid appointments?—No.

69. The salary paid to the schoolmistress at Sawyer's Bay is only £85, and yet I see you had thirty-six applications for the position?—Yes; but it is near town, and that salary there is better than £100 in the country.

70. Is it not a fact that preference is given to females in many appointments?—We do not discourage males in the country schools, but we discourage men living on a woman's salary.

71. If a man is willing to begin in a small school in order to qualify himself for a certificate, would you not give him the preference in a case of that sort—a candidate who has passed his examination, but cannot get his certificate until he has been two years in a school, and got the required marks from the Inspector?—The Board has done that frequently.

72. Do you not find too many pupil-teachers in the service of the Board, and that the Board should substitute one assistant for two pupil-teachers where practicable?—That is a detail dependent on the working of the school, and of the size of the class.

73. You do not hold yourself up as an expert in the staffing and organization of schools?—I hold myself up as an expert in nothing, but I give you my opinion for what it is worth. I have been a teacher, I am a member of the Education Board, and I am a citizen.

74. Does the system of payment to headmasters for instruction to pupil-teachers not obtain in Otago?—It did obtain, but has not done so for some years.

75. With regard to town and country schools, would you favour differentiation in the work that is required or expected in the town or country schools? For example, should the Inspectors be satisfied with a lower standard of work in a school conducted by one teacher than that expected from large town schools?—I am entirely against such a system. We should have the same system of education in the country schools as in the town, and the only reason we have not got them is that we do not pay salaries in the country sufficient to have that done.

76. Does your Board give facilities for transferring teachers from one part of the district to another?—If two teachers are desirous of changing, from any circumstance, the Board, if possible, considers it, and helps them.

77. Do you make it a practice of promoting your own teachers? If the first assistant leaves, do you promote the second assistant, or do you advertise the position, and possibly overlook the claims of the teachers in that school?—The School Committee has to be consulted in the matter. The Board advertises for applicants for a vacancy, and the Board allows those names to come forward who have served the Board well under various circumstances. Within recent years it has done its best to prevent unjustly an assistant being promoted, simply because he happens to be there, without his being thoroughly qualified.

78. Do you not think that if you adopt a scale of staffs and salaries the department should fix a minimum under which the Education Board would not be at liberty to establish small outlying schools?—If the department are going to multiply regulations they should abolish the Boards and manage the whole affair from the department.

79. I notice in the last balance-sheet of the Otago Board that the cost of the Inspectors came to £2,218. Against that you received a Government grant of £500, leaving a deficiency of £1,718. If the Inspectors were placed under the central department would it not save the Otago Education Board £1,718 a year?—No; it would relieve us of the cost of the work of inspection, but the Government would reduce our funds accordingly.

80. Supposing this were saved to the Education Board, would they not be in the position to increase the salaries in the small country schools?—I point out that it would not be paid to us. The grant of £3 15s. per head is to cover all expenses, including inspection.

81. Well, if the cost of inspection were diverted from the Board to the central department, would not £1,718 be saved to the Board?—Yes, perhaps it would.

82. Are you in favour of separate schools being established for boys and girls?—No, I am not. I think it is a most absurd proposal.

83. It obtains, you know?—It is a very good experiment, but I would be against making it a rule.

84. Your teacher gets no assistance until his school gets to 50?—He has assistance in the shape of a monitor, but I do not think that is of very much value.

85. What do you consider would be the number that a sole teacher can efficiently teach?—I think it is a very reasonable and wise suggestion that we have here in this second proposed scale—that the teacher should get an assistant when the average comes to 40. In country schools that means very often that you require to have 50 pupils on the roll.

86. You do not consider that, according to the proposed scale first submitted, it would be equitable for a male teacher to be reduced by £10, and that the £10 should go towards the payment of the sewing-mistress, when the attendance went up to 20?—I notice that in the first scale, and do not like it at all.

87. Do you approve of the scheme of conveying children to central schools rather than having too many schools in country districts?—It is impracticable. The small schools are so many miles apart that I cannot conceive of any circumstances whereby you could bring the children to a central school, and do away with some of the smaller schools, unless the children had wings, or something of that sort.

88. You are opposed to the proposed minimum certificate?—I would be in favour of increasing the demands made. I would not make it retrospective, however, but only to apply in the case of fresh appointments.

89. Would you favour a scheme whereby the brightest pupils in the primary schools should get free education in the secondary schools, and make the secondary schools a stepping-stone to the university—by means of scholarships or bursaries?—The thing has been in existence for long enough. Of course, I am in favour of the extension of free education as far as possible.

90. Are you in favour of the head-teachers of schools not district high schools being paid at the rate of district high schools for pupils who remain there after they have passed the Sixth Standard?—No; it would be simply frittering away the funds that should be available for providing properly equipped schools. It would keep children at small schools when they should go to district high schools.

91. *Mr. Hill.*] I understood you to complain that the country schools are defective because they do not pass as many pupils in the scholarship examinations as do the town schools: you estimate the value of schools by the result of scholarship examinations?—No, I do not; but I simply took that as an outstanding factor.

92. Are the country and town scholarship examinations the same?—Yes.

93. Do you not think that the reason why children in the country do not obtain scholarships is because the subjects are not adapted as well to the children in the country as they are to the children in the town?—That might be, partly. Our present examination is more suitable to town children than to country children.

94. Then, would you speak unkindly as to the efficiency of the country schools on that account?—Yes, because it shows that the standard of education in the country is less than in the town.

95. Do you want the same type of child in the country as in the town?—No; I use that example simply to show that the country schools were suffering because the teachers were not men and women of experience.

96. Would you infer that the country schools were less efficient than the town in consequence?—I am certain of it. It could not be otherwise.

97. Do you send out trained teachers?—Yes, as far as they can go; but no training will make up for lack of experience,

98. How many years have they been trained before they leave the training-college?—Our practice, I think, here is that they serve a four-years pupil-teachership, and after that a year or two at the training-college.

99. Do you not think that that should have sufficed to give them some knowledge in the control of small country schools?—Yes; but I say they are not sufficiently fitted for the circumstances.

100. Do you not think they are sufficiently trained to take up a small country school of 40 to 50 children?—Certainly not.

101. You think that such a school is very difficult?—Yes.

102. More difficult than a class of 60 or 70?—Yes, I think so.

103. Supposing you had a lady teacher in charge of a school of 30 children in the country and a lady teaching 60 children in the town, who could give the greater amount of individual attention to the pupils?—In the town class they have simply to work for one standard, and in the country school she has all the standards and all the subjects.

104. Which kind of teaching is the more effective—teaching a child or teaching a class?—It stands to reason that the teaching of a child is of greater effect than the teaching of a class.

105. Then, would there not be more individual teaching in a school of 30 than in a class of 60?—Not necessarily, because there are so many different subjects to be taught.

106. Supposing lady teachers have the same kind of school as males, would you not give them the same salary?—Up to a certain point I would.

107. *Mr. Smith.*] Do you think it possible for a single teacher, no matter how talented or clever, to teach seven standards and an infant department and fifteen different subjects as well as they are taught in a public school in town with a full staff?—I know it is impossible. My point was that the standard of education in certain necessary subjects in the country should not be less than it is for those subjects in the town.

108. With regard to the scholarships gained by country candidates, do not you think that the constant demand for child-labour in the country districts has something to do with their failure to obtain these scholarships?—Undoubtedly it may, but it will not explain anything like the facts I have laid before the Commission.

109. Do you think that the expense incurred by sending children to the centres would deter parents from inducing them to compete?—No; they are anxious to compete wherever they get the chance.

110. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Do you think that too much or too little allowance is made to the School Committees?—We do not give enough.

111. You say you give the Inspectors too much?—No; our Inspectors are not overpaid, but for the number of pupils we have now there are too many Inspectors.

112. *Mr. Weston.*] You would not object to a colonial scale provided that the amount of the capitation grant was sufficient to provide a sufficient rate of pay to teachers, *plus* the various other charges that this scale suggests?—No; but I say that this scale does not provide for certain things it should have provided for. I am not opposed *per se* to a colonial scale.

113. You also state that in your opinion the department ought not to have a colonial scale, but should provide a bigger grant for smaller schools and raise the grant for ordinary schools up to £4, and then leave the Boards to work out their own salvation?—Yes; the more difficult matter is that of payments.

114. Would not the logical conclusion of a colonial scale render it almost necessary for teachers to become colonial officials, movable from place to place by the department at Wellington?—I am not assuming that we are to be governed by logic. I may be in favour of a colonial scale, and yet resist tooth and nail the taking away from the Boards of the appointments of teachers.

115. Would not the logical conclusion of the position you have put forward be that the teachers should become colonial officers, transferable from one district to the other by the Government?—Undoubtedly, yes, the logical conclusion.

116. You know that before teachers can be transferred the Committees of the two schools must be consulted?—That is under the present Act.

117. Does not that render it, in your opinion, almost impossible to effect transfers of teachers?—Undoubtedly it does.

118. So that it comes to this: that the appointment of teachers must be made by the Committees, and the sending of the whole or a certain number of the applications to the Committee for selection?—That is so.

119. You state that teachers are leaving the service through the uncertainty of promotion: I do not quite catch the meaning of your argument?—There is a want of continuity in the methods by which this Board, at least, makes its appointments, so that a teacher cannot calculate with any certainty that if he fulfils certain conditions he will be promoted; some other stronger winds and currents may affect the result.

120. Would that, in your opinion, be obviated were the teachers to become colonial officers?—I do not think so, because I do not think mankind is differently or better constituted in a colonial department than in a particular district.

121. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do John Stuart Mill's remarks on liberty express your opinion as to the ideas that should rule education at the present day?—No; I do not agree with Mill's contention there. He is against State education. I am simply in favour of that extract which contains a principle which is quite sound apart from any use Mill might make of it.

122. Do you not think that a free syllabus would meet that point that Mill is contending for—greater freedom in the syllabus?—No, I do not think so.

123. When giving your answer on the matter of colonial scales, did you consider that what was meant was a colonial scale made and adopted with the sanction of Parliament?—I do not see

much difference, because the Government must be guided by the department, and the department scheme has the approval of the Government behind it.

124. Supposing separate scales were drawn up by the separate Boards and the scales submitted to the department, in the case of a difference between the department and the Board, who is to decide?—Well, the department is an abstract idea. If there is, say, a Board of three or four individuals to whom this should be submitted, then I should say that the decision of that Board would be final.

125. That is to say, a kind of Arbitration Board or Court?—Yes.

126. Do you not think it would be much better, instead of setting up an Arbitration Court for that particular matter, that it should be settled by a colonial scale drawn up by the department on the recommendation of such a Commission as this, and sanctioned by Parliament?—No colonial scale made so neatly as this will provide for the variations throughout the provinces.

127. These variations might become part of the conditions of a scale sanctioned by Parliament?—Certainly.

128. With regard to the payment of pupil-teacher tuition, you do not object to the colonial scale generally if that payment is already given by increase of salary?—But it is given quite irrespective of this motive to a teacher.

129. The number of pupil-teachers depends on the number in attendance?—Yes.

130. And if a teacher comes on there is the same increase when the pupil comes on at 30 as there is for 60, where another pupil-teacher comes on, so that the salary is given for the same purpose?—Yes; but it takes away the motive for education for those few extra hours to the pupil-teachers.

131. Could not that be overcome by regulations making it part of the set duties of the headmaster to instruct the pupil-teachers?—Yes, I think it might.

132. You are quite aware that the doctrine of equal pay for equal work is not suggested in the scale I have put forward?—Yes.

133. When you say that the salaries of assistants should be kept up, you would not expect to make the salaries of assistants too large in comparison with the salaries of head-teachers in small schools?—No.

134. Do you consider that too high salaries to assistant teachers in large schools would tend to keep them from offering themselves for headmasterships of small schools?—Undoubtedly it would have that effect.

135. And is it not desirable that men or women of powers that enable them to take responsible work should be tempted to go out into the country where the most responsible work is?—Certainly.

136. You would not raise the salaries of assistants of town schools so much that they would want to stay in towns all their lives?—No; but owing to the small number of headmasterships that are available the great number of assistant teachers must spend practically their lives as assistants, and my humble opinion is that headmasters of large schools are quite adequately paid, taking into consideration that they have a free house.

137. The salary given to first assistants is £250. The maximum now suggested for a scale of 200 is £252: do you not think it is very desirable to get those first assistants to make their experience as headmasters lower down than by succession to the headmasters of the big schools?—Yes.

138. If so, would it not be desirable to encourage them to go and take a school, say, of 200?—Yes.

139. Then, it is desirable that the salaries of the assistants should not be above the salary of the school of which he ought to take charge?—Yes, I admit that is the ideal state; but we have so few schools of that sort that it would not be practically of much value, and, as I said before, these large schools should be taken on their merits and an adequate salary paid to the assistants.

140. If you went too far in that direction, would that not lessen the temptation to the assistants to go into the country?—Probably it would.

J. Mitchell, Member of the Otago Education Board, examined.

Mr. Mitchell: I do not propose to take up your time at any great length, for I merely wish to touch upon one or two matters in relation to the staffing in the proposed scale. First of all, I would like to compliment the Secretary for Education upon having seen the propriety of amending his suggested scale by making it more in accord with the condition of things which prevails in Otago at the present time. As to the general question of a colonial scale of salaries, I may say that I do not think there is any merit in a colonial scale of salaries which does not fix the salaries as a definite quantity: to offer the teachers in the profession—every teacher—as in every other branch of the public service, a fixed salary, and not a salary dependent in any way on the attendance. I consider the only legitimate method of dealing with the question of salaries from a colonial point of view is to base the salary of every teacher in the service upon his or her qualifications and length of service, and that the Board should have the power of placing every teacher exactly where it is thought the greatest amount of good might be done. Unless Parliament is prepared to go to that length, then it is no use adopting a colonial scale of salaries at all; it will not remove the causes of agitation which have led up to the attempt to remedy the evil; for the teachers feel that their salaries are uncertain, that they depend upon conditions and circumstances over which they themselves have no control. Besides, you are not going to remove the second cause of complaint, and that is the absence of any method of regular promotion. In this scale, so far as Otago is concerned, you are going to aggravate the evil so far as males are concerned. It is proposed that in no schools shall the positions of first and second assistants be filled by male teachers, and that at once cuts away from the male teachers a large measure of oppor-

tunity of promotion. It will also have the effect of casting upon the female teachers a work that this Board, at any rate, thinks is better in the hands of the males, and for which females are not physically capable. The effort of this Board has been, as far as possible, to have the training of the higher standards in the hands of the male teachers.

Mr. Hogben: I may point out, Mr. Chairman, that that condition is not in my suggested scale.

Mr. Mitchell: Then it would appear that I must have misread it. A note appended to the scale on page 5 reads, "In mixed schools of from 36 to 250 in average attendance, if the head-teacher be a master, the first assistant must be a mistress, and *vice versâ*; in mixed schools of from 251 to 600 the assistant masters must not occur oftener than in every alternate position—*e.g.*, first, third, and fifth assistants, or second, fourth, and sixth assistants." I think that note confirms the statement I have made.

Mr. Hogben: No, it does not.

Mr. Mitchell: Then the misfortune is that either I am not capable of interpreting it aright, or that the gentleman who drew it up is incapable of placing his ideas in English that can be understood. I, of course, do not say that in any offensive way. However, to continue, another thing I find omitted in the scale that is suggested is that in regard to the staffing no discretionary power is given, as we have in Otago, of the Board employing a certificated teacher in lieu of two pupil-teachers. The principle of doing that, I may say, has been found to be of considerable benefit, especially in schools with a medium attendance and a large number of rooms. Another objection is this. From end to end of the colony a difficulty has been experienced in getting boys to enter the profession as pupil-teachers, and this scale proposes to diminish the present inducement by cutting away a considerable part of the remuneration. In Otago, for the first year, it would be reduced by £10. Here we have not been able to get a sufficient number of boys to come forward, and, unless something is done, the ultimate result will be that the profession must drift into the hands of females. With regard to assistants, under the scale they will be at pecuniary loss in Otago; and I find, so far as Otago is concerned, that only nineteen female assistant teachers would receive additions to their salaries, while I find there is not a male teacher who would gain.

141. *Mr. Luke.*] Are you referring to the Otago Education District?—Yes. I find there are no less than forty-nine assistants who would lose by it, and that their loss of salary would range from £5 to £50; the total number of teachers who would lose under the scale is 283. Under the suggested proposal, if my reading is correct, we should have to displace a very large number of our second assistants in Otago. The Secretary for Education has said that my interpretation is wrong; however, I leave that entirely in the hands of the Commission. With regard to the bearing of the proposal on the finances of the Board, and the finances of the Committees, I find that under this proposal the Board will be placed in a slightly better position, taking into consideration the expenditure of last year. But the expenditure of last year was unusually small on account of the Board having seized, as a matter of necessity, a large part of the grant previously made to the School Committees. We had a heavy overdraft, and the Committees' allowances had to be reduced; at the present time in Otago there is no Committee that can properly discharge its duties upon the amount that is paid to it, and it has been one of the aims of the Board to restore the grant. The amount taken from the grant to Committees was £1,000, and under the present proposal it will be impossible—it will be out of the power of the Board—to restore the same and see that the Committees are in a position to properly discharge their functions, for the total gain to the Board will not amount to more than £400, and the Board has still an overdraft of £1,950. This brings me to a remark made by Mr. Fraser, of the possibility of Parliament ear-marking a part of the capitation grant for salaries. If that is done, then Parliament should at the same time ear-mark the grant for Committee allowances. I hope that the Commission will devise some plan of providing for the necessities of the smaller Boards without encroaching in any way upon the functions of the Boards generally, or depriving the colony of the advantage of having a variety of systems all tending to educate the people towards what I hope will be, some day, a much higher system of education.

142. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Are you in favour of an equal salary being paid to male and female teachers?—No, I am not; because I recognise the fact that men have responsibilities which do not devolve upon women—the responsibility, for example, of maintaining families. Another reason is that I do not think it is a wise or proper thing, in a country where males predominate, to offer inducements to females to remain single.

143. Is it not a fact that there are more females employed in the profession because of the lower salaries paid to them?—That is possible; but there is this question to be faced: if you are going to raise the salaries of the females to those of the males, then you are going to cast a burden upon the colony that cannot be supported. To equalise salaries you would have to reduce the salaries of the males, with the result that the males will be driven out of the profession, and their places taken by females.

144. In small schools, in which you will admit that females do the work as efficiently as males—in schools with an attendance of 30—should not females be given exactly the same salaries as males, up to the standard of a living-wage?—Yes, most decidedly; I do not contend that you should starve any one out of the profession. I think females should not only have a living-wage, but should have a salary upon which they are able to maintain their dignity as teachers. If, in the case of a small school, a female is prepared to surrender all the advantages of city life and go into the back country to take charge of a school, she should be remunerated well: she is surrendering not only the immediate advantages, but the possible advantages—such as the possibility of marriage—by so isolating herself.

145. *Mr. Hill.*] You stated that the salaries of teachers should be based upon qualifications and length of service: what would you suggest as the lowest qualification for a teacher?—That

depends upon the supply; the qualification now is very low, and if you can, by offering better inducement, get higher qualifications, then by all means draw the line higher. I believe an E certificate to be too low. I think a D certificate should be the minimum.

146. Assuming the same qualifications, would you differentiate the salaries to them in consequence of length of service varying?—Undoubtedly length of service should be a factor in determining the salaries to be paid, combined, of course, with quality of service.

147. You stated that Boards should have the power of placing teachers where the greatest amount of good could be done?—Exactly.

148. That would imply placing a good teacher in charge of a country school?—Yes, and for this reason: Very often you will find that the value of a school has been destroyed, possibly, by inefficient teaching, and it is very desirable that you should be able to pick out a teacher specially qualified to rehabilitate that school.

149. Who should have the power of sending the teacher?—The Board.

150. You would suggest that Committees should have no control as to the disposing of teachers?—I do not suggest that. I give the reason as a necessary contingency of having a fixed salary; the one must accompany the other. My view is that the power that is given to Committees has not been exercised either to the advantage of education or to the advantage and promotion of teachers. A method should be devised by which regular promotion should be assured, and Boards should have greater power to transfer teachers without having to consult to such an extent the School Committees.

151. You think that greater fairness would result to the teachers if the power was given to the Boards?—Yes; I would not strip the Committees of all the powers they possess, of course; I would leave them to show cause why a certain teacher should not be appointed.

152. Assuming that an Inspector found it desirable, in the interests of a school, to remove or to change the teachers—transfer them—would you suggest that such powers should be exercised?—I may say that I do not think the Inspectors should have the power; I think the Inspector and the Committee, in the event of a teacher not doing well, should report the circumstances to the Board, and suggest a change, and that the Board should then consider how that change should be made, and, in the best interests, appoint another teacher.

153. *Mr. Weston.*] What would you suggest should be done with the other man?—If a teacher had destroyed the value of the school, or, by coming into conflict with the residents of the district, had destroyed his influence; or if he did not maintain the dignity of his position, then I would say that teacher would have to take another, even a subordinate, position, and I do not think such a teacher should receive very much consideration.

154. *Mr. Hill.*] Have you found teachers adapted to one class of school and inadapted to another?—Yes.

155. Then what would you do in such a case?—That is what I have already pointed out, you are unable to diverge from the regular methods; you must get the sanction of the Committees. I say the Boards should have the power to effect exchanges in such cases without such consultation; there should be the power of removing teachers with a view to getting rid of local trouble.

156. Would you give a teacher in a country school a salary equal to that given to a teacher in a town school, other things being equal; you say the Board should have the power of placing teachers where the greatest good could be obtained?—Exactly; yes I would do that. It seems to me a matter of the first consideration. No matter whether a teacher has a class of 60 in a town school or is teaching all the standards in a school of 30, the question of salaries should not be governed by the number of children taught, but by the teacher's capacity and experience.

157. Where would you draw the line in placing town teachers in country schools?—I do not think you should draw the line at all. No Board would send its higher salaried teachers to small country schools; the Board would select a specially qualified teacher for the work, a teacher who would be capable of building up a school.

158. I understand you are not in favour of females having an equal salary with males?—I do not think the females are capable of doing the same work, and I do not think it would be prudent to ask them to do the same work.

159. Has a female to do the same work as a male in order to get a certificate? Has she to spend fewer years in preparing for a teacher?—No; she has to go through the same ordeal as a male.

160. In order to prepare her pupils has she to do less work?—That depends on the number of pupils. In regard to this question of male and female remuneration I think Mr. Fraser answered the question very well to-day, and he embodied part of my view on the matter—that there are responsibilities devolving on the teacher—the male teacher—outside of the school altgether.

161. Are not the responsibilities of the females equal to those of males, say, in the matter of training children?—I do not think you would ask a woman to do outside of a school that which you would ask a man.

162. In what respect?—Well, a male teacher should take an interest in out-door games—athletics, for instance. You would not expect a woman to go into the cricket-field or the football-field.

163. Do you not think a female teacher managing Standard V. and doing as excellent work as any of the masters should receive an equal salary?—No. If you go through any of the Dunedin City schools you will find that a very large number of the female teachers who are doing the heavy work are having their lives destroyed. I have been through some of the schools myself, and have noticed the weary, dejected, jaded appearance of female teachers doing the heavy work of the standards.

164. Does the Government differentiate in the payment of fees for the training of boys and girls?—No.

165. The Government gives the same capitation allowance?—Yes.

166. *The Chairman.*] I understand your opinion is that, instead of teachers being paid on the basis of average attendance, they should be paid according to their qualifications, their length of service, their general good conduct, and their efficiency?—Yes, most certainly.

167. Does the Board advertise for applications when vacancies arise?—There have been occasions when the Board has not done so; but the practice generally has been to advertise, to receive applications, then to make a selection and forward the names on to the Committee, who have the next choice, and the choice of the Committee is afterwards confirmed by the Board.

168. If that practice is to be continued, how are you to adjust the teachers in the positions according to their capacities and their ability to do the work they may be called upon to perform?—We are not able to do it: that is one of the complaints. Pursuing the course we do we are not able to select the best men for the positions, nor are we able to promote teachers in order of merit and seniority.

169. You are of the opinion that, in order to remove the difficulties that have arisen in connection with the payment of salaries and the method of staffing, it is desirable that there should be a radical reform in the system of making appointments?—Yes, I think so.

170. Can you give the Commission any idea how that reform may be brought about?—Parliament should clearly define the relative powers of Boards and Committees. I would not entirely strip the Committees of any voice in the matter of the appointment of teachers; instead of giving them the choice, I would cast upon them the onus of stating why a particular teacher should not be appointed.

171. You would give the Board the ultimate power of making the appointment?—Yes.

172. Are you aware as to whether the Education Act does not confer that power on the Boards at the present time?—It is a point in dispute. I believe it has been held that "consultation" means something more than an intimation that you intend to make a certain appointment; that "consultation" means that you give to the Committee an option; I think that is the view held and which prevails in Otago. Of course, there is no such thing as consultation if it is said, "We are going to appoint this man or that man."

173. Do you know whether the question has ever been legally tested?—I think the question was tested here in the case of the Kaikorai School. I think the judgment was in favour of the School Committee, but cannot say for certain.

174. Are you not of the opinion that if the Board had the power, and exercised it, of transferring competent and experienced teachers from schools where the attendance had diminished, and where they were not fully employed, to larger schools, where they would be able to give a full return for the salaries paid them, a great deal of dissatisfaction and difficulty would be removed?—Yes; but the difficulty is that the Board has not got the power; it has been done, but purely as the result of negotiation, first, between the Committees, and, secondly, between the teachers interested.

175. How is it that the Board has not got the power?—The fact that it is necessary to consult the School Committees settles the question, in my mind. What has been done by the Board has been to give notice that where the attendance falls below the minimum the teacher will be withdrawn. That has been done. We have withdrawn males and substituted females, but there is not the power of transfer.

176. If the Board submitted the qualifications of the teachers proposed to be appointed to the Committee, and afforded full information, so that the Committee would be in a position to make full inquiries in order to make their representations to the Board—representations to which the Board should give every consideration—would that not meet the requirements, do you think?—Yes; as an individual member of the Board, I have held, and I still hold, the opinion that there is not that exchange of confidence between Committees and Boards that there should be. We should take the Committees more into our confidence and give reasons why we propose to adopt a particular course; although it seems to me, even if we do that, it scarcely meets the term "consultation." The probabilities are that the Committees would be satisfied. That this has been done by some Boards does not convey to my mind that it is right; it may be that the Committees have been too poor to test the question properly in the Supreme Court, and necessarily there is a reluctance on the part of School Committees to enter upon legal action which would involve them in considerable expense. We find a very great indisposition on the part of teachers to go into the back-country schools, and the Board, in suggesting a division of the special vote, resolved that, if they would not go, at least the money should be sent there—that there should be the positions, at certain good salaries. We have advertised positions without inducing applications. Last month, I think, we advertised a position carrying a salary of £100 in a country school, and for that position we received four applications from females, and of the four only one had had experience as a teacher, so far as I remember, speaking from memory. At the same time we had fifty applications for a city position of junior assistant, carrying a salary of £85, and the bulk of the applicants were females who had been teaching in the country, and who were anxious to get into the town. I believe in offering inducement to strong and experienced teachers to go into the country, or the result will be that the character of education in the small country districts will be extremely poor.

177. You are of opinion that children in the country settlements should have at least as good an education as the city children?—My view of the matter is that every child should have the best possible education you can give, no matter whether the child lives in the town or the country.

178. *Mr. Weston.*] I assume that while subjects should be thoroughly taught in these small country schools you can scarcely expect the syllabus to contain the whole of the subjects taught in the town schools?—On the same principle that you are unable to give them all the advantages of town life, of course.

179. *The Chairman.*] Do you consider that a highly qualified teacher should be placed in charge of a town school while an inferior teacher is placed in charge of a country school?—Most certainly not. If you have a good supply of thoroughly qualified teachers they should be distributed over as broad an area as possible: simply because a school may be a large one is not a sufficient reason why you should concentrate all, or even the greater part, of the available higher talent in that school. I think that the salaries attached to country positions ought to be considerably higher than those attached to the city or town schools, for the reason that you not only ask a teacher to become isolated from what I may term "society," but to surrender a number of other advantages, as I stated before, and you also impose considerable expense in travelling; for a teacher will not be content to live all the year through in the country, and if placed a considerable distance from Dunedin naturally a teacher, who would wish to get into the city at times, would be under great expense.

180. You say that you receive very few applications for positions in the country: are the applicants males or females mostly?—The small country schools are placed under the care of females, except in very out-of-the-way places; unfortunately these are generally girls who have just come out of a training-college, without any experience whatever other than that received in the training-college.

181. Is that not a strong reason why country teachers should be more adequately paid?—Yes; I have already said that.

PATRICK GUNN PRYDE, Secretary of the Otago Education Board, examined.

182. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you considered the first suggested scheme set down?—Yes, I have looked through it.

183. Apart altogether from the question of staffing, what is your opinion as to the salary attached to the first grade of school?—I have worked out some figures: 15 and over 19—say, 15 to 20—it is a little more liberal than the Board pays at present; under 14 it is not quite so liberal. The Board pays now £70 per annum for all schools with an attendance under 14, no matter how low the attendance may go, even if it reaches 5 or 6.

184. Then your opinion is that, in the grade of schools from 14 to 19, the salary is a more satisfactory one than that obtaining under the Board's present scale?—Yes; say, from 15 to 20.

185. In your opinion, is it wise to pay a salary of £70 for a school with an average attendance below 14?—No.

186. You think that the suggestion to pay a capitation grant of £5 for schools up to 14 a wise one?—Yes.

187. What is your opinion on the proposed scale in regard to schools of 19 to 40?—I do not think it is as liberal as the Otago scale.

188. Give me an instance of the salary attached to a similar school under the Otago scale?—From 31 to 35, £140.

189. Take from 20 to 25; what would the salary be?—£85 for a female.

190. In the suggested scale it is much more liberal in that grade?—Yes.

191. Take from 26 to 30, what would be the salary?—Under our scale, £105. I can instance two schools, each with an average attendance of 28, that are near each other—only a river between them—one of whom would receive £110 8s., and the other £115 4s. Nothing will, in my opinion, justify such a difference in payment for the same work.

192. In regard to a school with an average attendance of 35, under the Otago scale what would a female teacher receive?—£105.

193. Under the suggested scale?—£134.

194. An increase of £29?—Yes.

195. A male teacher would receive £140 under the Otago scale, and £150 under the suggested scale: is that right?—Yes.

196. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you find that there are many teachers leaving the service in Otago?—Very few. I do not think I ever knew a teacher who did leave that was not very anxious to get back.

197. Do you consider that females in charge of the small schools, doing the same work as males, should receive the same remuneration?—Up to a certain point.

198. What size and class of school do you consider a female teacher can teach as efficiently as a male?—There are seven schools in the district with an average attendance of 40 taught very successfully by females.

199. You consider that up to a living-wage a female should receive the same salary as a male, and above that living-wage the salaries paid to males and females should be equalised as much as possible?—Anything of a social question I do not express an opinion upon. I do not think it is fair to pay females the same salaries as males, considering the obligations males are under. A man has to support a wife and family, and in nine cases out of ten a woman has only herself to support.

200. Do you consider that female teachers in charge of schools should be paid 10 per cent. less than male teachers in charge of schools?—I think 10 per cent. is not enough: I think a headmaster's extra responsibilities and expenses considerably more than 10 per cent.

201. Do you find that the Otago Board gives preference to female pupil-teachers and female teachers?—No; it is not that they give preference, but that they are forced to. In the Board's report last year, the number of applications for pupil-teacherships was stated to be sixteen females to one male, and since then three boys have left the service. There is a great difficulty in getting boys to enter the service.

202. Then the Otago Board does not discourage applications from males?—No, the Otago Board has offered larger salaries, and has held out inducements to them to enter the Normal School as students.

203. On account of females being able to teach sewing, and on account of the salaries paid them, does your Board not give preference to females ?—No ; up to 31 of an attendance all schools in Otago are supposed to be taught by females.

204. With regard to scholarships, you heard the evidence of Mr. Fraser this morning as to the efficiency of the work done in town and country schools, and as to more scholarships being gained in the town schools than in the country schools : Do you consider that is a fair criterion of the efficiency of the respective schools ?—No, I do not think that is quite a fair way to put it. I would not like to say that for every country pupil competing for a scholarship there are twenty in the town. The better way to calculate it is as to the percentage of scholarships gained by country boys as compared with town boys.

205. Is it not a fact that in country schools where the head-teacher has no assistant, and there are six standards with a preparatory class, the teacher is not able to devote time to instruct pupils for the scholarship examinations unless by neglecting other pupils ?—I do not know. They do it, and very successfully in some cases.

206. Do the teachers in Otago pride themselves on the number of pupils taking scholarships in their schools ?—I do not know. I am not prepared to answer that straight off ; I should think every schoolmaster would pride himself upon such a fact.

207. You are opposed to penalising teachers who do not hold the requisite minimum certificate ?—Yes.

208. You are of the opinion that more power should be placed in the hands of Boards by the Legislature in the direction of promoting and transferring teachers to other educational districts ?—If there is one alteration in the Act required more than another it is to give the Boards full power to do so. I know of twenty cases where a man's family would have been saved from ruin if the Board had had the power to say to that man, " You report yourself at such and such a school within a certain time."

209. You have not heard any general complaint from the teachers in Otago to the effect that they are called upon to do too much work : you think they are prepared to do the same work as long as they receive the same remuneration, rather than receive additional staffing and a reduction in salary ?—I have never heard a complaint from the teachers as to the work they have to so, as long as they are well paid.

210. You consider that Otago attracts the best teachers in the colony : you give them fair salaries, and expect a fair amount of work from them ?—Yes.

211. Under the proposed scale, do you consider that the remuneration to pupil-teachers is sufficient ?—No ; we cannot get male pupil-teachers at the salaries we pay now, and I am sure we will not get them under this scale.

212. Is there any difficulty in Otago in finding employment for pupil-teachers when they have completed their pupil-teachership course ?—Within the last year or two, owing to a falling-off in the attendance, the number of teachers has been slightly in excess of the requirements ; but, on present indications, the attendance will increase. Of course, if this scale of staffing were to come into operation, we would have to go to the street-corners and gather young people in and make teachers of them.

213. Do you think it advisable to differentiate the salaries of teachers in districts where the cost of living is exceptionally high ?—That question was thrashed out by this Board twenty years ago, and it was decided that it was not practicable to do so ; and if it was not thought practicable or necessary then, it is not now.

214. Did you notice under the proposed scale that a reduction of £10 will take place in the salaries of head-teachers, when the attendance goes up to 20, for the purpose of paying a sewing-mistress ? Do you consider that reduction equitable ?—No. In Otago a sewing-mistress is not allowed until the attendance is 40, and she is paid £20 a year, and in many cases the sewing is taught by the schoolmaster's wife. The Board had a regulation in force paying £1 for each girl in average attendance ; but, owing to straitened circumstances, that has been altered, and the Board now only pays a sewing-mistress when there is an attendance of 40 pupils.

215. Does the Board expect the sewing-mistress to teach other subjects than sewing ?—There is a regulation dealing with that : " When the sewing-mistress is capable of teaching the lower standards she shall be so employed for the half of each day for an additional salary of £10 a year. If the sewing-mistress is not capable, then a monitor is employed at £10 a year." In most cases the sewing-mistress is capable.

216. You would not approve of employing a sewing-mistress who does not teach the sewing, but instead teaches twenty-five hours a week for a salary of £12 a year ?—No, certainly not ; we do not employ " dummies " at all.

217. Do you consider that the expenses of training-colleges should be defrayed solely by the Government or the department, and not out of the funds of the Board ?—Yes, the total expenses should be defrayed by the State.

218. What is your opinion with regard to placing Inspectors under the control of the central department, and so relieving the Boards of the extra cost ?—I cannot see that there would be any saving of cost.

219. You infer that you would not get a capitation grant of £3 15s. ?—No, I do not ; some one would have to pay it.

220. Your Board, according to your last balance-sheet, expended £1,700 ?—Yes.

221. Then you would save that amount if the Inspectors were placed under the control of the central department ?—No ; the placing of Inspectors under the department opens up a very big question.

222. *Mr. Hill.*] You pay a salary of £70 to all teachers in schools below 15 in average attendance ?—In schools below 20 ; no matter whether there are only 5.

223. How many schools have you below 15?—We have thirty-two under 15.

224. What is the minimum number for which you allow a school?—The Board has for some time been carrying on schools with only an attendance of 5 or 6.

225. Do you call those household schools?—No; if you look at the map you will notice them [schools indicated on map]. The attendance has fallen considerably in those schools, and the Board has, at enormous cost, carried them on.

226. Do the residents or parents help towards the maintenance of those schools?—Many of the schools are in districts where the residents are too poor to do so. Not only does the Board pay £70, but an extra grant of £10, making £80 altogether.

227. They are carried on at an enormous loss, then?—Yes.

228. You say there is a difficulty in obtaining male pupil-teachers?—Yes.

229. Is it in consequence of the work they are called upon to do—not only teaching, but their own studies? Is it the salaries paid?—Well, of course, the natural tendency of young people is to get as much amusement as possible, and as great an amount of freedom as they can. With regard to the salaries, the Otago teachers at present are better paid than the young men in offices, warehouses, banks, and trades.

230. Then, if such is the case, why do they shun the profession for other avocations?—There are not many who leave school-life when they have obtained certificates; a few have done so this last year under the impression that they were going to make their fortunes at gold-mining.

231. You approve of the transfer of teachers as the Board thinks advisable?—Yes, I am decided on that point.

232. Is there any reason why they should not be removed under a colonial scheme?—I do not care how it is done, so long as it is done. Whoever is responsible for the appointment of teachers should have the power to move them as thought fit.

233. I would like to have your opinion as to the desirability of a superannuation scheme for the older teachers in the service: do you think it is desirable?—Yes, I think it is. The Otago Education Board has been anything but mean with respect to its old teachers; it has been exceedingly liberal.

234. Could you suggest an opinion as to how it could be brought about?—I do not see that there would be any difficulty. The Government might deduct from the salaries of the teachers, monthly, a small sum, as in the case of life-insurance. Why should they not be compelled to make certain payments every month for the purpose? A scheme might be arranged on the lines of the police superannuation scheme.

235. *Mr. Luke.*] Could not a half-time school system be arranged here—itinerant teachers?—No; many of the schools are so far apart.

236. *Mr. Smith.*] Does your Board recognise the fact that under this Act they have a perfect right to transfer teachers from one district to another without consulting School Committees?—I never have held the opinion that the Board cannot change teachers without the approval or consent of Committees. There is a misunderstanding about that; they can do it, but cannot appoint or dismiss.

237. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Will you put in a list of allowances to School Committees and other matters appertaining thereto?—Yes.

238. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you believe in a colonial scale?—I do not, for the reason that I think the teachers will be far better treated by the Boards than by the Government. What seems to me to be the better way of looking at the matter, from the point of view of the Boards, is to give the Boards the extra 5s., and they will treat their teachers far better than the Government would.

239. Would you ask the Crown to give a special sum to assist the very small schools throughout the colony?—I believe if this Board received £4 a head capitation it would not ask any assistance in regard to the small schools; it would be in a position to give all the assistance required. When I tell you that the Board pays £80 for the teaching of 10 children, I think you will admit that is more liberal than the Government is prepared to be.

240. *Mr. Weston.*] We have household schools which might require assistance, and it is of that class of schools I spoke when I asked you about special assistance being given?—I cannot express an opinion of that class of schools.

241. You do not believe in a colonial scale of salaries, but you do believe in the appointment of teachers by the Board?—Yes.

242. If the power of appointment of teachers were removed from the Committees would it not mean that the Committees would be really little better than the caretakers of the school-buildings?—Committees will find quite enough to do after the appointment of teachers is taken from them. In many districts the appointment of a teacher does not come about once in ten years, at least in the Otago districts. There was an appointment made yesterday, and the predecessor of the gentleman appointed had been in the school sixteen years.

243. I wish to know if you think the appointment of teachers should be entirely in the hands of the Boards?—Yes, in the public interest, and in the interests of education generally.

244. Under the colonial scale you are of opinion that a number of your teachers would be thrown upon their own resources, or be compelled to take inferior salaries?—Yes, teachers in Otago now, who are receiving salaries of £180, would lose £60 or £70 a year under the proposed scale if brought into operation. Many of those teachers have gone through the training-college and through the university, and are filling their positions very satisfactorily.

245. Could yon undertake to give the Commission your suggestions in a tabulated form?—Yes.

246. Assuming that the teachers in Otago are sufficiently well paid, can the staffing of the schools be taken as satisfactory?—I have never heard any complaint from the teachers that they are overworked, and I am not going to admit that the teaching is not as efficient as in other parts of the colony.

247. Then, you think that your staffing is liberal?—Yes.

248. With regard to incidental expenses, what do you allow the Committees?—It is not a very liberal scale in that respect. Some three or four years ago, when the pinch came, the Board, instead of reducing the salaries of the teachers, reduced the allowance to the Committees by £1,000; and there was an understanding that as soon as the Board's finances were in a satisfactory condition the amount would be returned.

249. What is your maximum allowance?—£115 a year for every school between 700 and 750.

250. Is that sufficient, in your opinion?—No.

251. Then, I suppose your other incidental allowances have also been insufficient?—Yes; this scale has been in operation a little over two years.

252. How do they manage, then?—Committees get up concerts and entertainments. The expenses in the towns are heavier than in the country districts, and for that reason the allowances should be more liberal in the towns than in the country districts.

253. Do you do anything in the way of technical education in your schools?—The Inspector would give you full information upon that point.

254. Would not technical education involve a considerable alteration in the syllabus?—I understand that such a thing is promised.

255. Do you think the alteration is necessary?—Yes.

256. How do you think a material alteration in the syllabus will affect the education of children generally?—Judging from the cry that has been raised during the last few years about the inspection and examination of schools, and the standard passes, I think that the introduction of manual instruction will be a considerable relief to the syllabus.

257. Will that relief be beneficial to the children generally?—I could not express an opinion upon that.

258. *Mr. Hogben.*] Can you give me a return showing the expenditure of the Otago Education Board for the years 1898, 1899, 1900, exclusive of teachers' salaries and allowances, training of teachers and pupil-teachers, scholarships, school-buildings, buildings, furniture, plans, supervision, &c., and inclusive of office staff and salaries, contingencies, inspectors' salaries, travelling-expenses, examination of pupil-teachers, incidental expenses of schools, truancy inspection, members' expenses, interest and bank fees?—Yes, I will do that; 11s. 3d. will never pay the Board's expenses—at least this Board will not find it sufficient.

259. The Board carried on with it for one year, and that is why I ask for a return for three years?—Yes, it carried on at the expense of the School Committees by reducing them £1,000.

260. Speaking for the whole of the colony, not only for the Otago District, did you notice that the total amount available for the expenses of the Boards—the thirteen Boards in New Zealand—under the proposed distribution of the £4 capitation grant was nearly £6,000 more than the amount actually expended by the Boards in 1899?—Yes, I have seen it.

261. Then, if there is £6,000 more available throughout the colony than the Boards actually spend, it is only a question of the method of distribution so that each Board will receive enough, is it not?—Yes, that is so: I understand so from your explanation. Might I ask, if this Board finds that the sum of 11s. 3d. is not sufficient to meet demands, is it reasonable to conclude that amount will be increased?

262. *Mr. Hogben.*] If this method of distribution does not give each Board enough to meet its expenses we shall have to devise a better method of distribution?—11s. 3d. will be more than enough for some Boards, but not for the Otago Board. I do not see any provision made for sick leave. It costs this Board nearly £400 a year for sick leave, and where is that coming from.

263. I will ask the question if a good many of the difficulties you have mentioned would not be overcome very largely—first of all, if four years were allowed to bring the scale into operation so as to allow the Board to work its own way towards the adoption of it?—No; it would not do away with the difficulties. We have an overdraft of £2,000, and you take away from the Board the means of paying this amount off.

264. I understand your difficulties in that way, but I do not think that should confuse the main issues of the introduction of a colonial scale of staff and salaries. Overlooking those circumstances as to the overdraft, do you not think the difficulties you suggested would be minimised by giving a period of four years?—Yes, if you pay the £4 to the Board in the interval so as to allow of a more liberal payment to Committees. I think I have a perfect right as treasurer to see how every £1 spent is provided for.

265. You agree to the general principle in that particular form, that some of the difficulties would be removed?—Yes, some of the smaller financial difficulties. My opinion is this: here are three, four, or five teachers doing the same work; I do not care whether one of them has been twenty years in the service and another five years. If the teacher who has been five years in the service is doing the same work we should pay him the same salary.

266. Your test is the number of passes?—No; I say the reports of the Inspectors.

267. You would spread the total deductions for each class equally over the teachers of that class?—Yes; the teachers in certain classes should be paid a certain salary.

268. These deductions amount, on the head-teachers, to something like 2½ per cent. You are in favour of reducing the salaries by that amount all round in order to equalise, are you?—Yes; I think you are perpetuating here what has been one of the greatest bones of contention in Otago—a bonus system.

269. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] When you saw the scale submitted you concluded that 11s. 3d. was all that was available?—Yes.

270. If I were to tell you that a School Committee in Christchurch, with the same attendance as Mornington, received an allowance nearly double what you pay Mornington—£163, as against Mornington's £88—you could not see how that would make up the difference?—No; I cannot see how you are going to do it.

271. Or, say, where a school in Nelson of 277 gets £370 allowance, as against about a quarter of that in Otago, you do not see how the difference will be made up?—No.

272. In providing allowances for schools here you pay a caretaker as much as £90 a year, and give him a free house, do you not?—Yes; and it is absolutely necessary to have a caretaker resident on the premises.

273. Have you had an opportunity of seeing the schools in North Canterbury?—No.

274. Or of knowing indirectly? If so, do you consider that they are up to the standard of the Otago schools?—I cannot say.

275. Is it not a fact that some of your small schools with 6 pupils are costing £110?—Yes; on a school of 6 pupils we get £22 10s. from the Government, and we pay £80.

276. Is it not a fact that, while justice is being done in Otago to those schools in scattered and remote districts, this Board is able by careful management to pay higher salaries than are paid in any other district in the colony?—Yes.

277. With regard to the question of sewing-mistresses, there was a question put to you about the amounts to be paid: is it not a fact that you have under consideration the question of more liberal provision for teaching sewing in schools where girls preponderate?—Yes; reverting to the old regulations.

278. There is an impression prevailing abroad that this Education Board bars teachers from other districts from entering its service, or, in other words, boycotts them: is there any truth in that statement?—Not a vestige of truth.

279. *Mr. Hill.*] Can you tell the Commission how many teachers have been introduced into Otago during the last ten years?—A considerable number. This very afternoon I sent on the name of an outside applicant for a town vacancy.

280. *The Chairman.*] When you invite applications for vacancies in your schools with large attendances, do you get many outside applications?—We get a few sometimes.

281. Do you get many?—Not very many—nearly all from teachers who left Otago and want to get back.

282. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Is it not a fact that the standard of the teachers in this district—their training and qualification—is above that of the teachers in other parts of the colony, and therefore it is not so easy for outside teachers to obtain a footing in this district?—The majority of the teachers from other districts who apply for appointments in this district are not very highly classified, and very often they have to be thrown out because their classification is not high enough for the position we want filled.

283. *The Chairman.*] You say that the teachers in the Otago District are better paid than the teachers in other districts?—I would not say all round, but they are in some positions.

284. Naturally good salaries will attract outsiders, but you prefer the teachers you know something of, all things being equal?—Yes, the Committees do.

285. Do you think that a colonial scale of staff and salaries framed to meet the requirements of teachers in other parts of the colony would give general satisfaction?—I should not like to insult this body of intelligent men by saying that it could not be done.

286. Do you think it wise to take the payment of salaries out of the hands of the Education Boards and vest it in the State?—No, I do not; I think the Boards will deal better with the matter than the Government, and will give more satisfaction to the teachers.

287. Has your Board been occasionally compelled to alter the existing scale of allowances and salaries?—Yes.

288. Frequently?—Several times.

289. In what direction?—In order to equalise matters.

290. Not in the way of reduction?—Not on the last two occasions.

291. Do you think, if the power of dealing with the salaries passes out of the hands of the Boards, that there is likely to be more satisfaction than exists at the present time?—No; £4 per head is not very much, and I am confident, so sure as I sit here, that a time of depression will come, and the £4 will be reduced to the £3 15s. again: it will be the first thing the Government will do.

292. Do you think, if the cry of retrenchment arises, that the teachers are more likely to suffer under a colonial scale than if they were under the control of the Boards?—Yes; I firmly believe they would, if they were paid from the Treasury instead of by the Boards. The Boards may have ways and means of saving.

293. If you received a capitation of £4, the extra 5s., do you think you would be able to carry on in a satisfactory manner?—We would be in perfect clover. According to that we would be entitled to £4,500.

294. Do you know whether the teachers have been clamouring for a colonial scale?—I do not think they have: I have too much faith in their good sense and judgment to believe so.

295. Are any of the teachers, in your opinion, underpaid?—Yes; there is a class or two, but not many. I think the teachers in Otago as a whole are fairly well satisfied with their positions.

296. What schools do you think are underpaid?—Schools of from 15 to 30.

297. You know something of the cost of living in the country?—Yes.

298. Do you think £70 a reasonable sum to be paid to the teacher of a small school?—No.

299. For either a male or a female?—No, it is not.

300. Do you think it is vastly insufficient?—Yes, I think it is.

301. What do you think would be a reasonable salary to pay a young male teacher in a school of 15 to 25?—I think if the district is suitable for females a girl should be placed in charge of such a school. The experience of Otago is that they do the work quite as well as males in such schools, and they are more appreciated by the residents in the districts.

302. Then, what salary do you think a female teacher should be paid as a reasonable salary to live on, to clothe herself, and to provide herself with the necessary books?—In schools of from 15 to 19, £100; from 20 to 25, £105 to £110. There are many of the girls who go to these country

schools who have a sister or a mother who are anxious to go and live with them, as there is a comfortable residence attached to the school; under those circumstances, they are fairly well paid at £110, much better so than if they were receiving an equivalent salary in Dunedin.

303. Have you any difficulty in getting pupil-teachers?—No difficulty in getting female pupil-teachers, but a difficulty in getting male pupil-teachers.

304. What is the reason you find a difficulty in obtaining males?—Up to the last two or three years there was no difficulty, but latterly there has been a great demand for boys of all descriptions in Dunedin. I think it is simply owing to the prosperous state of things, and the demand for male labour.

305. There are not so many avenues open to females as to males?—No; and teaching in these small country schools is really the position for girls.

306. You think they fill the positions suitably?—Yes; I know in cases where the attendance increases, allowing of a male, a female is preferred.

307. For positions in your schools carrying a salary of £150 you have no difficulty in obtaining male teachers?—No.

308. Do you think that the profession is overstocked?—No, I do not think so; some of our teachers have gone North—to Taranaki and Wellington.

309. You consider that the fairly-paid teachers are satisfied with their positions and their lot in life?—Yes.

310. *Mr. Hill.*] I understand you would like the 5s. capitation grant paid to your Board?—Yes.

311. Are you aware of the state of other Education Districts, such as Marlborough and Nelson? What would you suggest in order to bring them up to a better position financially: would you suggest a differentiated capitation grant?—Yes; in all those small districts.

312. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Are there residences attached to your schools?—Nearly all.

313. *The Chairman.*] Are the teachers' salaries and house allowances allocated together?—No; we pay house allowance separate.

314. Does the first assistant master get house allowance?—No.

315. Have you caretakers to look after your schools?—Yes.

316. Have they residences provided?—In one or two cases they have.

317. They live rent-free?—Yes.

318. *Mr. Hill.*] Have you used any of the capitation allowance on buildings?—Not for the last five years.

FRIDAY, 17TH MAY, 1901.

PATRICK GUNN PRYDE: examination continued.

Mr. Pryde: I wish to submit a statement prepared by me to show how the proposed scale of salaries issued by the department will affect the teachers at present in the Otago Education Board's service.

Mr. Stewart: Any further statement Mr. Pryde has to make should be in writing and put in.

Mr. Pryde: I wish to show how seriously the teachers in Otago will be affected, some of them losing as much as £60 a year.

Mr. Hogben: No; only two.

Mr. Pryde: Very well; here are the figures, and I will stand by them.

Mr. Stewart: It seems that there are only ten.

Mr. Pryde: I will stand by my figures. I shall mention the teachers in detail. Mr. Reid, second assistant, Union Street, would lose £65; Mr. Spence, second assistant, Albany Street, £65; Mr. Marshall, second assistant, Normal, £65; Mr. Stewart, second assistant, Arthur Street, £65; Mr. Strong, second assistant, High Street, £60; Mr. Coutts, second assistant, Mornington, £50; Mr. Rutherford, second assistant, Caversham, £65; Mr. Maxwell, second assistant, Forbury, £60; and the second assistant at Mosgiel, £60. The master and mistress of the Kurow, Duntroon, and similar schools would also lose considerable sums. A return already supplied [Exhibit 22] shows what each teacher will gain or lose. The total salaries paid by the Board last year is also shown in the return. Last year the amount was £57,086. The annual amount proposed to be paid to teachers, according to the new scale, is £53,853, showing that they will lose £3,233, made up as follows: 283 teachers will lose £5,257, and 181 teachers will gain £2,124, which leaves the total loss at £3,233. There are only thirty teachers in the service who would not be affected. The proposed scale will give as an addition to the staff forty-five assistants at £80 a year, or £3,600, and sixty pupil-teachers (say, thirty at £35, and thirty at £42 10s.), or £2,325. The total amount for additional teachers would be £5,925. Deducting from that the £3,233 which the teachers will lose leaves the whole gain to Otago under the proposed scale at £2,692. I have placed before the Commission a statement, which in the first place presents a classification of the schools, and secondly the classification of the teachers who will gain [Exhibit 54]. I want now to refer to the Board's expenses. The total gain to the district by raising the grant to £4 would be £4,450. The total gain to the district by the proposed scale would be little more than half that amount—viz., £2,692. Comparing the payments by the new scale with the amounts that would accrue to this Board were the capitation fixed at £4 per head, there will be a loss to the Otago District of £1,758. I shall now refer to the Board's position, The annual grant to School Committees for incidental expenses is about £4,650. Two years ago the amount was reduced by nearly £1,000 per annum in order to maintain teachers' salaries. The Board anticipated a vote of 5s. extra per pupil, and the School Committees were promised that, as soon as the Board received this additional capitation, the £1,000 by which their allowances were reduced would be refunded to them. I have taken out the calculations on the 11s. 3d. basis proposed to be paid by the department. We may get more; but if we get no more I want to point out that by paying the School Committees exactly as they are now paid—viz., £4,650, or £1,000

less than they were paid two years ago—the Board will have only £730 to come and go on. I wish you to take notice that, as a set-off against the £730, the Board pays between £300 and £400 a year for sick-leave, and nearly £300 per annum for rent allowance and other items. Then, following out this staffing scheme to show how the allowing of an assistant in a school with an attendance of between 35 and 40 will work in Otago, I find that before the scheme can be put into operation in Otago we must expend the sum of £9,400 to provide the additional class-rooms that will be necessary. The schools in Otago are so constructed that it is impossible for two teachers to work in one room. I have made the calculations on the lowest basis. I have worked out another return, included in the same statement, to show how several schools in the district will be affected by the new scale, and what the staff would be. I want to lay special stress on the fact that no provision is made for teachers who are sick. Our regulations provide that a teacher shall be paid a full month's salary on producing a doctor's certificate that he cannot go on with his work. In Otago that means £300 or £400 a year; and if that amount and the amount of rent allowance previously mentioned are to be deducted from this £730 we will find ourselves on the wrong side of the book. Looking at the large number of teachers in the service, I do not think the percentage of teachers who get sick pay every year is at all large.

Mr. Hogben: That is true throughout the colony.

Mr. Pryde: Whatever alterations are made, there should be provision for these cases, and what is applicable to Otago is applicable to the whole colony. Then, in Otago all outside repairs to buildings are carried out by the Board, and if the School Committees wish the schools or residences painted inside they have to pay half the cost, raising it by local subscription. The Committees are called on in this way to raise a considerable amount locally every year. To show the liberality of the people of Otago, and their appreciation of the efforts being made for the education of their children, I may state that no less a sum than £2,444 9s. 8d. was raised locally for school purposes in Otago last year [Exhibit 53].

P. GOYEN, Inspector of Schools, Otago, examined.

Mr. Goyen: As Mr. Hogben has pointed out, both schemes before us are mere suggestions. That is, of course, a very important fact to keep before us. Mr. Hogben himself is not pleased with either of them, and I dare say we are all in the same boat with him. The aim of all is to make the scheme as perfect and practicable as possible. It seems to me there are two or three things for which every national scheme of classification and payment should provide. There must, of course, be an ample staff. There is certain work to do, and a sufficient staff to do that work should be provided. Secondly, there must be adequate payment for every class of teacher. Thirdly, there should, I think, be provided in that scheme substantial inducement for teachers to seek country rather than town appointments. The last of these is, I think, of very great importance indeed. The tendency during recent years, probably the tendency always, has been to gravitate towards the towns, and teachers go to the country with their minds made up that if they do good work there for a few years they will find themselves in the end in the city schools or in the large town schools. That is the aim. Hardly any one goes to the country with the view of remaining there. It is a very serious evil that the teachers of country schools should be changed as frequently as they are; and when I lay stress on inducement being held out to teachers to remain in the country, I wish to remove the chief cause of this desire for change, which is very detrimental to education in outlying parts of the district. As for the staff, I think Mr. Hogben's scheme provides for an ample one. I am not so sure about the modified proposal. Some parts I like, and others I am not quite sure about. I should have liked to see the table extended to schools up to, say, 600 or 700, to see exactly how the assistants and pupil-teachers are allotted, so that we might apply the figures to a concrete case or two.

Mr. Hogben: It comes to one pupil-teacher less in every school above 330, but the same number of assistants in each school.

Mr. Goyen: Then, this is my opinion about the staffing: that ample provision is made for it. It might be well, perhaps, for gentlemen of the Commission to know the actual staffing of one or two of our schools. I shall not name the schools, but I shall give their average attendance, and the number of children actually present in each class at the time of my inspection visit. I shall give for each school the Otago staffing, the proposed staffing, the Otago salaries, and the proposed salaries. These I shall place side by side to enable you to see at a glance their relative merits.

SCHOOL WITH AVERAGE ATTENDANCE OF 526.

Class.	Number of Pupils present.	Otago Staffing and Salaries.		Proposed Staffing and Salaries.	
		Teacher.	Salary.	Teacher.	Salary.
			£		£
VII.	24	Head-teacher*	324	Head-teacher*	322
VI.	43	Male assistant*	240	Male assistant*	210
V.	58	" *	175	" *	110
IV.	70	" *	112	" *	80
III.	63	Female assistant*	110	Female assistant*	120
II.	80	" *	85	" *	80
I.	63	Two pupil-teachers	...	" *	80
P.	150	Mistress and two pupil-teachers	150	Mistress and four pupil-teachers	160

* Two pupil-teachers assisting in these classes.

In this school the head-teacher was frequently absent from the Seventh Standard, doing work in other departments, and in the meantime a pupil-teacher carried on the work. Under the proposed scheme we find in Standard V. a very serious change, to which we Inspectors cannot bring ourselves to give our adhesion. We do not agree with it. It is our experience in this district that Standards VI., V., and IV., very largely owing to their great size, cannot well be taught by female assistants. The strain of such work is too great for them. Therefore we have adopted the plan of having the first three assistants male assistants, or the first two assistants male assistants, and I think that in every large school in the colony that ought to be carried out. The average female assistant is unable to teach Standards V. and VI., and frequently Standard IV.

319. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] If the girls and boys were separated that would alter the case?—Yes; that would be another thing. With regard to the pupil-teachers, this is where the difference comes in: The number of pupils present in Class P. during my visit was 150, and to teach that number there were a mistress and two pupil-teachers. In my judgment—and, I believe, in the judgment of every man who has considered the question from the actual point of view of efficiency—that number of teachers is too small. Under the proposed staffing there are a mistress and four pupil-teachers. That seems to be the smallest staff that should be allowed for the infant department. That would leave, under the first scheme brought before us by Mr. Hogben, three pupil-teachers for distribution among the standard classes. Under the second it would leave two pupil-teachers. They are needed. In Standard IV. there is a class of 70. In such a class there is a great deal of mechanical work that must be done by somebody other than the class-teacher, and the pupil-teacher is there to do it. With respect to the question of pupil-teachers generally, I may say that in Otago the real teaching of the standard is done by the assistant almost invariably in the large centres, and that the pupil-teacher is there simply to help him in mechanical work of various kinds. The intellectual training, however, is really done by the assistant. In that class of 70 you certainly want a pupil-teacher, and also in the class of 80; and a pupil-teacher's services will be found useful in other parts of the school. I think that three pupil-teachers for circulation amongst the classes are not too many; certainly two are not too many. Next take a school with an attendance of 590. I put in a set of these tables [Exhibit 60]. In the school of 590 the proposed adult staff is the same as ours, but it is assisted by three pupil-teachers more than we give, thus enabling the head-teacher to give the mistress two pupil-teachers more than she has now, and the rest of his staff the assistance of three instead of two pupil-teachers—in each case additional help urgently needed. It is beyond the power of any mistress to teach as it ought to be taught an infant department of 160 with the aid of only two pupil-teachers, as it is beyond the power of an assistant to teach classes like those of Standards VI. to III., ranging from 72 to 92, without assistance during a considerable part of each day. The assistance of two pupil-teachers is, I think, inadequate. Mr. Hogben's scheme gives three pupil-teachers—not too many, certainly. And here I would remark that in very large infant departments such as this it would be a distinct advantage to substitute an adult teacher for two pupil-teachers, thus giving a staff of two adult teachers and two pupil-teachers, instead of a mistress and four pupil-teachers. The adoption of the one or the other staffing should be left to the discretion of the Boards. I may here remark that in this school our Board has substituted an assistant for two pupil-teachers. It has done so to provide an adult teacher for every standard class—a most desirable thing wherever the class is of considerable size. Now, take the school with an average attendance of 430: You will observe that under the Otago staffing the head-teacher is responsible for the work of two classes—Standards I. and VII. How can a man so circumstanced gain the exact knowledge of the life of his school that a headmaster is, under the present regulations, expected to possess? The thing is out of the question. If you will now refer to the proposed staffing you will see that under it the headmaster can spend a portion of every day in familiarising himself with the work of his staff and with the pupils of every department of his school, and that the mistress will get the much-needed service of another pupil-teacher. Her department will even then be understaffed. Lastly, take a school with an average attendance of 169: In this class of school the mistress needs continuous and the headmaster and assistant occasional help. Well, under our staffing they get none at all, while under the proposed staffing they will get all the help they need, but certainly not more than they need. What has been said is sufficient to enable you to interpret the rest of it, and to show that from the point of view of efficiency the proposed staffing is superior to the Otago staffing.

320. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you consider that the new staffs are absolutely sufficient?—In some cases I should be glad to see additional members added to the staff.

321. Please tell us where?—Well, in this school of 169 I would have more assistance given to the mistress. For years past we have introduced into a number of our schools a large amount of kindergarten work, and anybody who knows anything of that knows that it cannot be carried on unless there is a great deal of valuable assistance. About 30 pupils or so is a large number to manage in that class of work; and if it is going to be taken up throughout the length and breadth of New Zealand we shall have to increase the staff in that department. I started by saying I thought the proposal provided ample staffing, and, so far as the schools to which I have now made reference are concerned, I think I have justified what I said about the provision made by the suggested scheme. With regard to payment, we Inspectors differ from Mr. Hogben, both as to his first and as to his second scheme—in some cases, though not in all. Take a school with an average of 17: Under the first scheme the salary would be £90, which appears to us to be too low. It is higher than we now give, but it is still too low. We Inspectors are much impressed with the conviction that you should make sufficient inducement for teachers to prefer country to town appointments. We want them to wish to go there and remain there. I would suggest not less than £100 to start with. These schools are frequently situated far from the teacher's home. The teachers who accept them are nearly all young women. They leave their homes in Dunedin or

near Dunedin, or some country village, and go perhaps a hundred miles from their homes. At the end of the year they are naturally anxious to get home, and the cost of going and returning will cost £10 or £20, which is a large tax on a very small income. That is a thing that should be considered in fixing the salaries of teachers of that class. Then, the further you get away from the centres, the more costly become the things a teacher must have—food, clothing, &c. That should be taken account of. We therefore think that £100 a year is little enough to start with in that class of school. In Mr. Hogben's second suggestion we have schools of from 19 to 40. We think that group should be divided into two—from 19 to 30 and from 30 to 40. Schools of from 19 to 30 could be taught by female teachers, and schools between 30 and 40 by males. The maximum salary attaching to schools of from 30 to 40 is £160. That class of school is a hard one to teach. The teacher of a school with an average of 40 will frequently have to teach from 45 to 50 pupils—a very big handful. The work is heavy. It is a school that can be taught only by an able young fellow, and we think that the payment should be greater than that provided. The work is nearly twice as heavy as that of the next group above. In this—40 to 65—the minimum salary is £165. It is our opinion that the teacher of the school of from 30 to 40 should be at least as well paid as the teacher in the group of from 40 to 65. We suggest that the amount should be £180. In addition, there should be an allowance of £15 for the teacher of sewing. As I am now at the sewing question, I may say we do not agree with the proposal of the department that the teacher, if a master, should give £10 per annum to the sewing-mistress. We do not like the principle. The department should pay, and not the teacher. In every school sewing should be taught, and so much should be paid for it, but the payment should be made by the Education Board, and not by the teacher. According to our suggestion, therefore, there would be an additional cost to the class of school between 30 and 40, and a reduction in the class between 40 and 65. Moreover, as I said at the beginning, it is very important to hold out inducements to teachers to seek the country, and remain there. In that class of school you find young men who are making provision for married life. Of course, they must have sufficient salary to be able to save and provide for the responsibilities of married life. With respect to head-teachers' salaries in the other groups we have nothing to say. They are up to the level—a little above, in some cases—of the Otago salaries. With regard to the assistants, who do not figure in this alternative scheme, we should like to have some more information. Our feeling is that the assistant teachers ought not to be reduced. Their present salaries are not too high; they should certainly be kept up; but we feel at the same time that the salaries of the country teachers should be raised considerably. With regard to the last group of schools—600 to 1,050—it is our opinion that these schools are too large. It is easy to classify and to work a school of 500 or 600, but it is very difficult indeed to classify and manage a school of 750. On the other hand, it is easy to classify a school of 1,000. If you have a school of 500 or 600 the classes will arrange themselves in such a way as not to be too heavy for one teacher, or for the teacher and a pupil-teacher—a single staff will do for the working; but if you have an attendance of 750 a single staff is not big enough, and you need to duplicate your adult teachers. The only element of difficulty in the 1,000 school is that the headmaster has to make himself acquainted with 500 more minds. He should be acquainted with the mind of every pupil in the school, and if there are 1,000 pupils instead of 500 his labour is doubled. Our opinion is, therefore, that the large school is an evil unless it is large enough to double the adult staff, and that even then it has the disadvantage of being too big for a single head. The next point is classification. Schools of from 14 to 19 may be conducted by Class E teachers in Division 6. For my own part I do not think an E5 teacher ought to be in a school of that kind at all. If the educational qualification of a teacher is not above E, and his qualification as an instructor is not above E5, such a person ought not to be in a school at all. I should propose that nothing short of a pretty high E should be there. E includes some excellent teachers, but E5 does not. The teachers to whom I refer have E2 and E1 certificates, and they should be eligible for appointment, but certainly those below E3 should not be. With regard to the second class, 19 to 35, it is a class of school to which we send young men and women who have spent four years as pupil-teachers, and have had a year or two in the training-college. If they have done their work in a satisfactory way, and won their certificates, they get marks enough to place them in Division 4, and if we give them four marks we mean to indicate to them that we think well of them. That is the start we give them. We know they are quite capable of conducting schools of the class of from 19 to 35. Our suggestion, therefore, is that D4 should be, at any rate, one of the qualifications for this class of school. With regard to the other groups, right down to 250, we think that D2 should be sufficient. A teacher placed in D2 gets 80 per cent. of the marks an Inspector can assign to him, and an Inspector does not give 80 per cent. of the marks to any person of whose capacity he does not think very highly. We regard 80 marks as very high, and when we give teachers that position in the service we regard the classification as very high. With regard to the next group, C1 is the qualification provided for in Mr. Hogben's suggestion. We think that D1 should satisfy. All other things being equal, the C1 man is a great deal better than the D1 man; but often other things are very unequal, and we do not think there should be a hard-and-fast line to exclude the man who has the D1 scholastic and other qualifications, and is also a man of considerable culture and reading. Then, if the schools of from 600 to 1,050 are retained the C1 should be regarded as a classification, making a man eligible for a position in that group. As to the classification of assistants, we suggest that in schools of 150 to 175 and upwards the first assistant should be classified D2. Mr. Fitzgerald suggests to me that D3 might be allowed to stand in the first group—that is to say, that a teacher who gets 60 per cent. of marks should be regarded as having sufficient qualification to fill that position. I have no objection to the suggestion. I have several times referred to the desirability of having the first, second, and third assistant male teachers commencing at the Fourth Standard where the average is more than 60. I think I need not say anything further about that. Then, in this district circumstances have always

governed appointments—very largely, at any rate—and hence it is that in a good many cases, instead of appointing two pupil-teachers, we have appointed an assistant. We would suggest that in a departmental scheme like this provision should be made for carrying out that arrangement. There is another matter: it does not concern Inspectors, but it concerns teachers very much. If the country is to have a first-class education given to the children it ought not to be unwilling to give good salaries. At present this arrangement obtains: If, owing to bad weather or other causes—epidemics, and so on—the attendance falls below one-half of the roll-number, the attendance is omitted when the average is worked out. I will tell you how this works out in this district. In all the larger villages, and in the cities, it seldom happens that the attendance falls to the half. It is only in a few outlying places in which that rule operates at all. It does not operate with regard to two-thirds of the children in the larger districts. Our opinion is that the half is too low, and we suggest that the proportion should be raised to two-thirds. That would, at any rate, include some of the larger country schools, and perhaps some of the city schools. We think, too, that the rolls should be purged every month. Whether the children are there or not, the year's work has to be done somehow, and if the teacher does not do it one day he does it the next day. He should therefore get payment. I wish also to refer to the payment to headmasters for the instruction of pupil-teachers. That payment is obviously included in the annual salary. Our opinion is that it had better not appear there, but as a separate thing, so that the payment for the work may stare one in the face in looking at the scheme. Certainly, there is a great deal of work to be done in connection with the pupil-teachers, and we think the teachers should receive extra payment for it, and that it should be regarded as a thing quite apart from the salary fixed for position. With regard to the promotion of teachers, the Board carries it out as well as it is possible to carry it out under present circumstances. It takes considerable pains to ascertain the facts and to do justice to everybody; but every educational district is, to my mind, something like a big department having a large number of positions in it; and there ought to be certain people in connection with it with power to shift teachers from this place to that according to their fitness. At present there is nothing like that at all. For a scheme like this to work out as it ought to, something like that ought to be provided for. The system of promotion will remain very imperfect so long as the appointments are made as they now are. No matter what pains the Board may take now, it simply cannot promote in a systematic and scientific way. According to the method adopted, the applications are first of all considered by a committee of the Board, which committee takes into consideration both the classification of the applicants and their testimonials. The applicants must have certificates of character up to date. With regard to teachers from other districts, they must have the reports of their Inspectors; and with regard to the teachers of the Otago District, they must have what the Inspectors here think about them. If the teachers outside Otago do not send their Inspector's reports or a certificate up to date, or if they omit something else that is regarded as essential, their applications are informal and have to be thrown out. The Board, as a Board, has no knowledge of the applicants. We Inspectors have no knowledge of them. We have among the applicants a considerable number of men and women of whom we have personal knowledge, and whose merits we know, and naturally the Board prefers to appoint those whom they know rather than those they do not know. I think that to that extent only do teachers from outside districts suffer disadvantage in their application for employment under the Otago Board.

322. *Mr. Davidson.*] Would you be in favour of a colonial scale of staff showing a more liberal staffing of schools than at present obtains in Otago, and showing also an equally liberal scale of payment for teachers?—Certainly.

323. You stated this morning that you thought the suggested payment for schools between 14 and 19 was not as high as it ought to be. The suggested scale for 17, for instance, was given as £90?—Yes; I say it should be higher than that. I have already mentioned £100 per annum as a start.

324. Would you suggest any minimum average attendance for the payment of £100 per annum?—I think that a person who goes to the country and teaches an average of from 14 to 19 children is certainly worth not less than £100 per annnm.

325. Would you be satisfied with the suggested payment for small schools under 14?—Yes, and in schools of from 20 to 30 I would be satisfied with the suggested scale.

326. In schools of from 30 to 40 the present salary paid in Otago is £150. The suggested rate is £160. You think that is not sufficiently high?—I think it should be a good deal higher.

327. *Mr. Davidson.*] Taking the next grade of schools, 40 to 65, do you think that the assistant should go in as early as that?—I think we could manage, say, up to 45. In Otago we have quite a number of teachers who conduct schools of that class, and conduct them well. The fact that that is done is proof, of course, that it is possible everywhere if you have teachers of the same capacity. We Inspectors thought first of all that a division might well be made of 35 to 45—the maximum average for one man being 45. We know it would be possible for many of our teachers to carry on schools of that sort; but for work of that kind salaries should be high, and if the number of teachers can be kept up on the 40 limit, we prefer the 40 limit.

328. It is more the cost of such schools than the efficiency of the staff. You think the staff is more efficient, and it is better for the children to have the assistants brought in at 40?—Yes, certainly.

329. In Otago a pupil-teacher is not allowed in addition to the master and assistant mistress until the 100 pupils attendance is reached: do you think that limit too high?—Yes.

330. You prefer that they should be admitted when the attendance reaches 90?—Yes.

331. You gave instances this morning of schools showing the present staff under the existing scale and showing the distribution of the staff under the proposed scale. I understood you to express the opinion that in schools of that grade where the Fourth Standard is fairly large there

should be at least three male assistants?—Yes, I think so; and they should be paid as first, second, and third assistants.

332. Would you indicate in what grade of school you think this is likely to appear?—I think a woman might, without any overstraining, teach the Fourth Standard up to an average of 60; but if the average reaches 60 and over, I say place a man there.

333. As a rule, do you find in schools having an average attendance of over 400 a Fourth Standard so large as to require a male teacher to be in charge of it?—It is difficult for me to fix upon a school with the exact number. The fact is, it is a thing you cannot determine quite by average, because the relative size of the class is a varying thing too. You sometimes have a very large class going right through the school, and at other times you have a smallish class going through the school. There you have a controlling circumstance, and we ought to consider such circumstances.

334. In your opinion, where the Fourth Standard averages between 50 and 70, you think that it should be in charge of a male teacher?—I will not go so low as 50, but if it averages from 55 to 70, certainly. If over 60, or near 60, I say a male teacher should be there.

335. Why not give preference to a female?—Because it is my experience that males control boys and girls at that age better than females.

336. It is not, I suppose, that a woman is mentally incapable, but simply that the physical strain is too great?—That is so.

337. In drawing up a scale of staff do you not think it better to take the male assistants together, apart from the females, and place them—first male, second male, third male, fourth male, and so on, and then take the females in the same way, instead of having them alternating as is done in this scale?—Yes, I think that might be a very simple modification. I do not know that it matters very much if you only allow the point that in the large schools the higher standards shall be taught by males.

338. You spoke of the promotion of teachers this morning? In your opinion would it not be wise to classify schools and positions, and promote teachers, not from grade to grade, but from class to class, so that a man or woman may rise from the bottom grade of one class to the top grade of another class?—It looks very well on paper; but in the Australian Colonies, where it has been tried, it does not work out well. Necessarily schemes of that sort are more or less mechanical, and the controlling element is length of service, and I am told that there the scheme does not work quite as anticipated, the mechanical element prevailing too largely.

339. If you were to rid such a scheme of the mechanical element—say, for instance, that the Board has a right to select from all the teachers in a certain class?—That would take away the mechanical element and make promotion more certain.

340. A witness stated yesterday that, in his opinion, the number of scholarships gained by a school showed the quality of the work done in that school; he stated, too, that that was proof that the calibre of the teachers in the country schools was not equal to the calibre of the town schools. Is that reasoning correct?—I do not think that sufficient facts are taken into consideration in that case. The gentleman to whom you refer brought forward one. It is a fact, no doubt, in some cases; in others it is mere assumption. There is always willingness of the child to prepare for such examination to be considered. There is another thing, the willingness of the parents to allow the child to enter upon it. In the country the services of the boys, and the girls too, but of the boys especially, are valuable at a very early age, and the parents like to keep the boys near them, and to settle them at work of the kind that they themselves have been accustomed to. I do not think there is any great wish on the part of country people to have their children prepared for these scholarships. Then, I think, the matter of enthusiasm on the part of the teachers counts. The teacher who is enthusiastic will succeed in persuading an unwilling parent to allow his child to proceed with the work, whilst another teacher who is not overflowing with enthusiasm, when he gets an answer in the negative to his request that a promising boy should be prepared for a scholarship, does not persevere in his endeavour, and lets the matter end there. If full of enthusiasm he will ask again and again.

341. Is it not a fact that a large percentage of the teachers at present in the town schools, and also assistants who prepare pupils for the examinations, have themselves been country teachers?—Yes.

342. Does not that go to prove that the calibre of the average country teacher is equal to that of the average town teacher?—I do not think it does, because they have been in the country and also in the town, and have profited by their country as well as by their town experience, and ought to be better than teachers of country experience alone. I think Mr. Fraser laid too much stress upon his point. There is no doubt that the bulk of the country teachers are capable of preparing pupils for scholarships, and the bulk of them are sufficiently enthusiastic to undertake the work if the parents were willing that they should.

343. *Mr. Stewart.*] In reference to the appointment of pupil-teachers under this scale, you spoke of one pupil-teacher being attached during a day to two or three different classes to do mechanical work: what about the training of the pupil-teacher in all the work?—This is what is usually done: During the first year or two, especially during the first year, the pupil-teacher is engaged in teaching all day, and does no mechanical work at all; in the second year he rises in the school, and does mechanical work during part of the day, and during all the course assists in mechanical work and does some teaching during the day, but is never entirely engaged in either kind of work.

344. It was a recommendation on your part that two grades of schools should be merged so far as salary was concerned. You said that schools up to 40 should be paid the same salaries as 40 to 65, on account of the work?—Yes.

345. Do you think that when a teacher is working a certain class of school, the fact that the class of school above him has a higher rate of pay is a great incentive to his work?—Yes, certainly.

346. Would teachers teaching in the class of schools to which we have referred be willing to take up that work without an additional rate of pay?—Probably not. Teachers change from school to school too frequently, and the desire is too great all along the line to get a change. If you make that school as good to the teacher as the other he will not care; but if you make it a little better he will rather be there. The only reason, then, why he would wish to get into the higher school would be that the work is easier. If I had my way I would give the teacher of a school of 40 a higher salary than that of the teacher of a school from 45 to 60.

347. You are aware that the order of reference limits us to £4?—Yes.

348. Is it not a fact that you advocate considerable rises, even on the amended scale, to a considerable number of schools throughout the colony?—Yes.

349. How would you remedy this financial loss on these schools if that recommendation was adopted?—I say you should press the Minister for more money.

350. You think that in the interests of education the rates of pay to teachers in Otago should be kept up?—I think so. I think nothing should be done to damp their enthusiasm.

351. We have heard a great deal about what your teachers are going to lose: does that loss entirely depend upon the difference of salaries, lowering the rank of the teacher, or does it depend on the alternation of male and female teachers?—I do not know; that is one of the things into which I have not gone.

352. Have you heard it stated officially that two-thirds of the loss of pay accruing to the teachers of Otago is due to the difference of status in consequence of the alternation of the male and female teachers?—I have heard on competent authority that such is the case.

353. You have heard a great deal about scholarships here: do you think the farm and home duties of the boys and girls in the country have any material effect in preventing the country children going up for scholarships?—Undoubtedly. The children in the country have to rise so early in the morning that they go to sleep over their work in school, and they go home at night so tired that they are utterly unable to prepare for an examination of that sort.

354. It is utterly impossible for the teacher, no matter how efficient, to get a scholarship?—I do not say that, but I say it is unfair that he should be expected to be able to compete with the towns.

355. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to teachers' examinations, are you in favour of uniformity of examination of pupil-teachers throughout the colony, instead of leaving it to the various Education Boards?—I should be in favour of uniformity if I could be sure of reaching a high level of attainment to begin with. Take the Otago level, for example: if we could only begin with the attainments which we insist upon here I should be satisfied.

356. You do not consider that there are too many pupil-teachers employed by the Otago Education Board?—I do not think so. There are about two thousand teachers in the colony, I think, under the present scheme. I really cannot say how many pupil-teachers there are, but in the contemplated scheme, say, about two hundred of them would pass out year by year, thereby supplying from 7 to 10 per cent. of the teaching staff, which is probably about the average wear and tear of such a staff as ours.

357. The number of pupil-teachers here, unless we are allowed to appoint an assistant for two pupil-teachers, will increase by eighty-six?—At present we have two and a quarter adult teachers to one pupil-teacher. That is approximate, but it cannot be very wide of the truth. Roughly, the proposed scale will stand thus: one and a half adult teachers to one pupil-teacher. The exact numbers are: Present scale, 181 adult teachers and 80 pupil-teachers; proposed scale, 229 adult teachers and 146 pupil-teachers. The correct ratio is not the ratio of pupil-teachers to the teachers employed in the colony, but the ratio of pupil-teachers to the teachers of the schools in which pupil-teachers are employed. In that way it comes out pretty high.

358. Do you consider that the salaries of teachers should increase by each unit of average attendance, or by grade, as is done in the Otago district?—I prefer the increase by units. I think a teacher is then paid for the actual work he does.

359. With regard to the exception you take to the proposed scale No. 2, would it not meet your views if, instead of what you propose, the individual increase between 40 and 65 was 10s. per head instead of 20s.—instead of bringing back the salary of a teacher when the attendance goes above 40?—I should be sorry to see any reduction in the capitation—I think it is not too high; but I do feel very strongly that it is of capital importance that an inducement to go to the country and remain there should be held out.

360. With regard to the staffing of larger schools, what school is your ideal of the most suitable type to be adequately staffed without reduplication?—I should say not above 600.

361. What would you propose, then, in the event of there being a school with an attendance of 800, and another school in the same town with an attendance of 450 or 500? Would you extend the bounds of the district, and encourage children to go to the school not so largely attended?—I think that would be a very good plan. When the limit of numbers assigned by regulation is reached in any particular class, it would be a fair thing that other children coming forward to join that class should be requested to go to another school. In theory the thing is good enough, at any rate; but I do not know whether the parents would agree to it. Classes are now allowed to grow to such an enormous size as to make them almost unworkable.

362. Do you agree with bringing in an assistant when the attendance goes above 40?—I prefer an assistant at that stage to a pupil-teacher.

363. Do you consider, on the whole, that the adoption of a colonial scale of staff and salaries would in any way tend to diminish the power or control of the Board over teachers?—I do not think so.

364. *Mr. Hill.*] You approve of a colonial scale?—Yes.

365. Would you approve also of a colonial system of promotion?—A colonial system of promotion has special difficulty in New Zealand. The circumstances of this colony differ from the

circumstances of the other colonies, partly owing to its extreme length and partly owing to the circumstance that we have no large centre in which the bulk of the people have congregated. I think it would be very difficult to arrange all these things from Wellington. But I should like to see the matter of promotion and appointment of teachers relegated to the Boards and taken away from the School Committees. I do not think that in such big departments as Otago and Canterbury teachers should be moved about without any consideration whatever of the wants and claims of the various parts or the districts. I think moves ought to be brought about by those who know all the circumstances of the various districts; there ought to be some controlling-power of that kind.

366. Do you think it would be advisable to remove Inspectors from district to district?—I am opposed to that. My objections are, in the main, two—one personal, the other impersonal. In the first place, we Inspectors have made our homes here in Dunedin, and are naturally unwilling to break up those homes; and, then, in Otago we have an excellent Board to work for, and we should be very unwilling to sever our connection with that Board. With regard to the impersonal matter, it takes a long time to get to know your teachers, and you need to be living in a district and working amongst the teachers for a good many years to know them as you ought in order to enable you to advise your Board respecting them. I apprehend that in New Zealand what will take place will be what has taken place elsewhere. If the department got control of the Inspectors, an Inspector would be stationed for two or three years in one place, and just as he got to know the teachers he would be sent away to inspect another group.

367. Does that necessarily follow?—No; but I point this out to you: that if there is any clamouring outside it is always that the Inspector must be periodically removed from one district to another.

368. Would not such a removal tend to greatly widen the views of the Inspectors?—They would come into contact with a larger number of people, and they would get a better knowledge of the physical geography of the country; but in other ways I do not see any advantage in it at all.

369. I see that each time you mention a school you give some special duty for the headmaster of that school: is it a rule in your Board for the headmaster to have a standard?—Yes. It has to be, because the staff is not sufficient to allow any other arrangement. He has to make himself responsible for the X Class or Seventh Standard, and frequently to do the bulk of the teaching in Standard I. or some other standard.

370. As to the arrangement of your teachers, are the assistants placed according to status: does the first assistant take the Sixth Standard and the second assistant the Fifth Standard, and so on?—That is the general rule.

371. Do you require them to do that?—No; the head-teacher is at liberty to make the best of the material placed in his hands.

372. Suppose the headmaster thought he had a more qualified teacher to take the infant department than the one already in that department, would he have power to do so?—Yes, I think so.

373. He could remove his assistants from class to class as he might think proper?—That is my view of his duties.

374. Does it not follow, according to that, that the teachers are really class-teachers simply with class responsibilities?—Yes; of course, they are appointed as such.

375. You mean to say that adaptation should take place in a school?—Yes; I think the headmaster is there to control the school in every way, and he is expected to get the best possible work out of the staff.

376. He might even place a first assistant to teach the Second Standard?—Yes, if he thought that was the best thing to do for the school.

377. Does not that imply also that there should be approximate payment in salary for those teachers?—You mean that if a lower one takes a higher one's place he should be paid the higher one's salary?

378. Yes?—As a matter of fact, the person who is the fitter of two persons for the more difficult position ought to be the person to get the higher salary; but, you see, sometimes it may not be a question of a more difficult position; it may be some other circumstance that the first assistant is not able to meet.

379. As to the instruction of pupil-teachers under the proposed regulations, and the non-payment for instruction to these, do you not think that each certificated teacher in a school should be required to do some specific work in the training of the pupil-teachers?—Not unless you make a special allowance for that in the salaries.

380. Who under the present regulations gives instruction to the female pupil-teachers in sewing?—The mistress, of course.

381. Is she required to do so under the regulations?—She is paid rather more than other teachers because of such duties as this.

382. Is there a regulation specifying the duties she shall carry out?—I do not think there is a regulation bearing on the point. It is to her interest to teach them, in order to get their assistance in the supervision of the sewing-work of the school.

383. With regard to scholarships, would it not be better to have separate scholarship districts?—I do not think so; I prefer the method here to that adopted elsewhere; and I think that here we err on the side of leniency to country districts. We insist upon the town children not being over thirteen years of age, and we allow country children to present themselves at fourteen years of age. Well, as an Inspector of Schools, you know what a year means in a child's life at that age. I think it is a great advantage to the country over the city.

384. My question had reference more to the preparation of the children in various districts—whether the interests of country life were the same as those of the town?—The subjects ought to be

such as all children must know. For example, there is no reason why country children should not know English and grammar as well as town children. Then, again, arithmetic, spelling, and writing: these are subjects in which we examine them for junior scholarships, and I do not think there is in them room for differentiation. In that class of scholarship the examination should be the same for both town and country.

385. What is your opinion as to the establishment of a special certificate for teachers, apart from any degree that may be held from the university?—I suppose the C is a special certificate, really; it is the highest certificate issued by the department.

386. What is your opinion as to a superannuation scheme?—I should be very glad to see such a scheme started; and when it is I hope to see the Inspectors included in it.

387. *Mr. Weston.*] Are there any objections beyond those you have mentioned in the proposed colonial scale, when read with the amendment?—I cannot think of any at present.

388. In a system of primary education the teacher should be paid an adequate salary independent of the capitation grant?—Yes.

389. Can you give me any information in regard to the necessary amount for incidentals in your district?—I cannot; it is outside my sphere of work.

390. Are you competent to say whether, in your opinion, the incidental allowance to the country Committees has been as much as they should be?—I have had to say that the money has not been made to go so far as it might have been made to go.

391. Are the schools in the country nicely kept, and as clean as they should be?—They are not.

392. In what are they lacking?—They are not swept or washed with sufficient frequency, and the walls and ceilings are not brushed at all.

393. Is that universal throughout your district?—It is not.

394. What schools would you except from that general statement?—I cannot individualise.

395. What class of school?—The large schools are generally well attended to; it is only the small school that is frequently found in that condition.

396. In those schools of which you complain, are the sanitary arrangements perfect, and are they sufficiently maintained apart from the school-building itself?—I have had frequently to complain about that, and the reply has been, "We have not money to do it efficiently."

397. Are the school-buildings themselves and all that are in them kept up to date and in good order?—They are not kept up to date in this way: The life of the furniture of a school ought to be a fairly long one. I do not know what is a fair estimate, but probably twenty or thirty years; and furniture that is put in now is out of date in ten years. Therefore it is not up to date in many of our schools.

398. In regard to the schools you have excepted, are they maintained in every respect as they should be?—On the whole, they are.

399. They might be better?—Yes, in some places—in the matter of dusting, and that sort of thing. Most of them are, however, kept in a very creditable manner.

400. Does the incidental allowance not provide for sufficient caretaking?—"No" is the answer with which I am always met.

401. For the sake of the moral effect on the children of cleanliness, should not the schools throughout the district be well maintained and kept at a high standard?—Yes, I think so.

402. I think you said that the controlling circumstances should guide the Committee or Board in the selection of a teacher for any particular school?—Yes.

403. Would the operation of a colonial scale in any way prevent the consideration of those controlling circumstances?—I do not think so.

404. That is to say, that a teacher of a particular grade and certain salary would not effect in any way the selection of a teacher for any particular school?—No; there must be in every district a number of schools about equal.

405. Would you deem it to be an advantage to the Education Boards throughout the colony to have direct power of transferring teachers irrespective of the views and desires of Committees?—I should be very sorry to see the Boards run counter to the feeling of local people; but at the same time the Boards ought to have a larger control than they seem to have now. I think, in all transfers the Board ought to have the chief control.

406. If the appointment of teachers were entirely removed from the Committees, the Committees, I presume, would be no more than caretakers of the school-buildings?—I do not think they would occupy that position necessarily. It is to the interests of all to have a good teacher. If there is widespread dissatisfaction with respect to a teacher in any district, it is the duty of the Committee to gather up the threads of dissatisfaction and report the matter to the Boards. But I hold that Committees are not in a position to judge as to which of a number of candidates is the most suitable for a school.

407. You advocate, if not entirely, certainly a partial removal of the power of appointment that exists at present?—Yes.

408. That being so, of what particular benefit beyond the care of the school-building itself would the Committee be?—The Committee are there to represent the parents, and to see that the teacher, so far as they are able to judge, is attending to his work. They are there to act, if need be, as a buffer between the teacher and the parents. The matter of appointments is only one thing, and it is certainly not the most important function of Committees. They discharge other very important functions; and if they lose that, why should they cease to discharge the others?

409. We have heard a great deal about pupil-teachers: do you think that the pupil-teachers under the existing system receive sufficient instruction in the theory and practice of teaching?—It is very hard to say for certain. We have to trust the teachers, as honourable men, to give the time that is expected from them by the regulations.

410. Seeing that you examine the pupil-teachers, are you not able to gauge the soundness of the instruction, both in theory and practice, that they receive?—Not always; because in a city like Dunedin, and in other towns as well, the pupil-teachers may get outside tuition in their work. We can only say whether the work set them has been well done.

411. Do you think that the pupil-teachers should devote a certain number of hours of the day to the ordinary work of the school, and that the balance should be devoted to instruction?—I think that pupil-teachers should not teach five hours a day, but unfortunately the finances of this Board—and I suppose the finances of the other Boards—have prevented that ideal being reached.

412. Will the allowance of pupil-teachers as suggested by Mr. Hogben be sufficient to permit pupil-teachers to devote a portion of each day to instruction?—I think it would allow that very fairly, especially the first suggested scheme; the second is much less liberal.

413. Do you think that would give sufficient time during the day for instruction?—It would not allow as much as we desire, but it might allow one hour a day. The attendance, to be an attendance under the Act, must be one of four hours a day—two in the morning and two in the afternoon. It has always seemed to me that a day of four hours is too long for infants, and we would like to see some modification of that—say, three or three and a half hours. A large body of the teachers would then be set free to teach in other parts of the school, and pupil-teachers might set about their literary work.

414. Is that suggestion absolutely practicable?—I think so.

415. And is it such a suggestion as would be acceptable to a teacher?—I think so.

416. Does there occur to you any disadvantage attaching to the part of the scheme referring to the non-payment of the master or mistress for instructing pupil-teachers?—I think that the only disadvantage is that the exact payment for that work is not stated.

417. Do you think that the teachers would be likely to impart the same amount of knowledge and take the same amount of trouble with pupil-teachers as they would do if they were not paid for that special work?—I think it is important that the actual amount paid for a certain part of service should be stated.

418. I gather that you approve of payment for that special class of work?—I do.

419. What would be a fair payment for instructing pupil-teachers?—I think what was paid here until recently—£10 for the first, £5 for the second, and £3 for the third and all others—would be fair payment.

420. Do you think there are enough training-schools in the colony, or should there be more?—I think there ought to be more—one in every university centre; and I think that the literary work of the students in each of these centres should be taken at the university, and what bears on teaching—psychology, and that sort of thing—should be taught by special men.

421. The training-school should be a school not only for instruction in matters pertaining to the duties of a teacher, but of practical instruction in school-teaching?—Yes, and that school ought to be specially staffed.

422. Would it, in your opinion, be better or worse that the training-school should be under the control of the Boards or under the control of the Government?—That is a question I have not thought about at all.

423. What is your opinion in regard to technical instruction in our primary schools?—Strictly speaking, we have no technical instruction in our primary schools. In a good number of our schools here we have what is known as kindergarten work.

424. I do not mean instruction in carpentering or any manual work, but instruction in the theory and science of industries?—You have only to reflect that the children we have to deal with leave school at fourteen years of age to see that technical education in the true sense of the word is impossible in primary schools. I think there is a vast deal of erroneous thinking about technical education. The technical education that is going to do New Zealand any good cannot be taught in our primary or our secondary schools. The technical education that is going to affect the life of a nation has to be taught in the universities. And it is to be work not done while the students are pursuing their ordinary university course, but it must be done in research classes established in connection with the universities. That is what would affect the life of our nation, as technical education is affecting the life of Germany.

425. Would the introduction of technical education in our primary schools necessitate a material alteration in our syllabus; and would it be prejudicial, in your opinion, to any portion of the children in the various schools?—It would be altogether prejudicial to the schools.

426. Can you combine manual instruction with the ordinary education of our schools with advantage?—Yes.

427. Would manual instruction necessitate a material alteration in the syllabus?—I do not think so.

428. When would you give manual instruction?—I would begin at the lowest class and carry it right through.

429. Would it be necessary to remove any subject from the syllabus in order to make the necessary time?—Less prominence might be given to some subjects to which too much prominence is given now.

430. Would the two hours a week at present allowed in the regulations for manual instruction be of any practical service?—I think it would.

431. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You say that in Otago the amount of incidental allowances is not quite sufficient to enable the work to be done?—That is my opinion, so far as I understand that department of the work.

432. If the incidental allowance was increased by the Government, would that be sufficient?—Yes, I should think so.

433. Do you think that schools in an education district with 33 per cent. more to spend than we have are justified in complaining about the allowance?—No.

434. Take Canterbury: they spend 33 per cent. more than we do, and yet they are calling out for more?—I would like to see their schools first of all to see what are their external and internal conditions.

435. Do you think that the allowances proposed in the first scale are anything like adequate for our Otago first and second assistant teachers?—No, I do not.

436. Could we hope to get anything like the results in the future as in the past by such a change?—You could not expect it.

437. You think the service would degenerate?—The service would suffer.

438. Do you think it would be possible to attach to our district high schools a department that will give tuition in the science and theory of the prominent industry that happens to be in the particular locality?—Certainly that could be done. Sufficient knowledge could be given to the children to make them interested in the industries of their respective localities.

439. What effect has our present district-high-schools instruction upon the brightest boys: does it guide them into the prominent industries of their district?—I do not think it does. I fancy that the boys and girls in the district high schools mostly work with a view of matriculating, or of passing into the Government service through the medium of the Civil Service Examination.

440. Do you not think, therefore, that the result of their training is rather in the wrong direction so far as the backbone industries of the country are concerned?—Yes, I think so.

441. Regarding the allowance for house or rent for teachers, would you prefer to provide a dwellinghouse to allowing the rental charge to be made on the building grant?—With regard to the towns, I do not think it matters very much whether rent be allowed or a house, but if rent is allowed it should come out of the building grant.

442. You have no opinion as to which is the better system?—No.

443. Have you studied the educational systems obtaining in the other educational districts, and can you suggest any improvement on ours?—I do not think I have been in any of the schools outside Otago, except one or two of the Auckland schools, during all my New Zealand career. I really do not know minutely what is being done inside, although I know in a general way the character of the work that is being done.

444. So far as you understand the systems in New Zealand, which system would you prefer?—I think the systems are very much alike.

445. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you think it would be an improvement on the suggested scale, and a good feature to introduce into any scale adopted as a colonial scale, to allow a certain amount of freedom in staffing schools, such as is implied by the substitution of an assistant for two pupil-teachers, or the substitution of a male assistant for a female assistant and a pupil-teacher, sometimes?—I do not think there should be any hard-and-fast rule.

446. But there must be limits to that?—Yes. I think that the Education Boards, which would always be in possession of a knowledge of the circumstances, would be in a position to do the right thing.

447. Now, with regard to number of pupils per teacher, you gave us five schools with an average number of 448, ranging from 169 to 625. In the first school the average number of pupils per teacher, counting pupil-teachers and assistants, is 40·5; the second one, with 430 pupils, has an average of nearly 48 per teacher; the third, 492, an average of 44·7; the fourth, an average of 56·3; and in the last one, with 625, there are 44·6 pupils per teacher: do you consider that that staffing is sufficient to carry out a reasonable ideal?—I think 40 fairly workable. It is usual for such schemes to vary from 37 or 38 to 45, the mean coming to about 40, which seems to me to be a fair mean.

448. Do you know the proportion in London or Birmingham?—No.

449. Would you consider that 35 pupils per teacher was a better staffing than yours?—Certainly.

450. You said that the average salary in schools from 15 to 19 of £90 was too small a one to begin with, and you recommend a salary of not less than £100. That would cost £2,534: would you take that amount from the other salaries?—No; the Government should provide for an efficient scheme.

451. You think that the teacher in that class of school should be paid at least as large a salary as a teacher in the class next above—viz., in schools of 40 to 90?—Yes, in schools of 40 to 65.

452. What does Otago pay now to those schools?—I think, about the same as you propose.

453. Do you not think that the difference in difficulty of working a school from 30 to 40 and working schools from 40 to 65 might be considerably diminished by differentiation in the syllabus required, in the way of lessening the number of subjects?—Even so, from the circumstance of there being so many classes to teach, and all classes being moderately large, I think that it would warrant a larger salary there. There is this other circumstance: we must, if possible, retain our teachers in schools of that kind.

454. Would you be in favour of omitting from a colonial scheme of staffs and salaries the suggested rule for making deductions for low certificates?—I would.

455. Would you also expect the Government to pay £10,000 for that?—Yes.

456. And should the Government pay for sewing-mistresses also?—Yes, I think so.

457. You are in favour of classification of teachers akin to the Victorian classification of teachers if the mechanical factor was eliminated?—Yes, I said that.

458. Do you think it possible to eliminate the mechanical factor?—I do not know.

459. Do you think it possible to make promotion of teachers on such a system as that suggested, without centralisation in Wellington?—The body of teachers in each separate education

district, if to be controlled by the Education Board, must be counted as one unit, promotion to circulate within that unit. If promotion is to be a colonial affair, then New Zealand is the unit, and promotion must circulate within that unit, and the department in Wellington is the centre from which it should emanate.

460. You think with me that it is desirable that appointments should be made by the Boards? —Yes.

461. In order to avoid any misconception, I want to ask you one question with regard to technical education. Is there any intention of introducing technical instruction into the primary schools indicated in the regulations recently issued?—I do not think so.

462. Regarding the payment for pupil-teachers' instruction, you have already said that it might be a great advantage if pupil-teachers were replaced by assistants. In that case the remuneration of headmasters for the instruction of pupil-teachers would be lost?—Precisely.

463. The headmaster might sometimes reflect that if he recommended the displacement of two pupil-teachers by an assistant he was cutting off £6 from his salary?—That has frequently been done here.

464. It would be a disadvantage to ask a man to suffer for giving good advice?—It would.

465. *The Chairman.*] Have you had any difficulty in getting teachers to go to country schools?—As a rule, we have quite enough applicants for the positions that fall vacant from month to month.

466. And in cases where the salaries, in your opinion, are adequate, do you find plenty of applications for those places?—Oh, yes.

467. You have expressed a strong opinion that the salaries in country schools ought to be very materially raised?—Decidedly.

468. Do you think that those are the poorest-paid servants of the Board for the work they perform?—For the work they perform and the sacrifices they make.

469. When those country schools become vacant do you receive applications from the town teachers to fill them?—Now and again a town teacher seeks employment in the country, but very rarely.

470. What class of applicants send in applications—male or female, experienced or inexperienced?—For small country schools, for the most part young folk who have been a few years at work; for town positions you get all classes applying, and amongst them those who are living, and who have lived for a long time, in remote places.

471. What is the process adopted by your Board when a vacancy occurs?—There is an appointments committee, who first of all read the applications and testimonials. Length of service is considered, moral character is considered, the Inspectors' reports on and estimate of the applicants are considered. It is upon all these that the recommendations to the Committees are made. After that, the appointment passes almost entirely out of the hands of the Board and rests with the Committee.

472. Do you send the whole of the applications to the Committee?—Not necessarily; but if in the opinion of the Committee all the applicants are eligible all the names are sent. If, on the contrary, some are regarded as more eligible than others their names are sent and specially recommended, and the list of the other applicants along with the testimonials is also sent. The Committee is expected to select from the first list; but now and again the selection is made from the other list, but the Board does not very often carry out the Committee's wishes in those cases.

473. Thus the Committee virtually possesses all the power of ultimate choice of teachers? —Yes.

474. Is there any canvassing done by the teacher?—I hear there is a great deal of canvassing, but I have no personal knowledge of it.

475. Assuming there is a great deal of canvassing, what is likely to be the effect?—The most able canvasser is apt to get the position.

476. Assiduous canvassing is likely to prevail over merit?—Yes.

477. You do not think that such a system as that is extremely humiliating and degrading to the applicants?—Decidedly it is.

478. I think you already stated you would prefer that the power of making appointments should be concentrated more in the Board than it is now?—Yes.

479. With regard to this £10,000 which I think Mr. Hogben stated would be the extra cost of doing away with what are virtually fines for low certificates, and which you hold in many cases to be unnecessary, do you think a fine of that description is justifiable?—I do not.

480. What is your experience of teachers holding D1 certificate: do you think they are competent?—D1 men vary exceedingly. They have to pass the same examination, but examiners will tell you that there is a wonderful difference in the quality of the passes. One man may get a pass with 60 per cent. and get a D certificate, while another may get 80 or 90 per cent. But, apart from that altogether, if a young man takes his D certificate and continues his studies he is, year by year, improving himself; but, on the other hand, if he ceases his study immediately after he passes his examination he does not advance with the times, and gets behind.

481. Examining the reports, year by year, of the department, do you not see that the majority of the larger schools in the colony are held by teachers holding D1 certificates?—That is so.

482. And you do not hear any complaints about them not being able to carry on their duties? —I have not heard any complaints.

483. Do you think there should be differentiation of syllabus between town and country?— One is always afraid that the children living in the country may suffer some disadvantage by the exclusion of this or that subject from the syllabus. But if there were a few optional subjects, and the teachers were allowed to select any one or two of these, I think there might be an advantage

that; but I should be very sorry if the principle were admitted that the country child is not worthy of the same education in English, grammar, composition, arithmetic, and geography as the child of the town. There should be no differentiation there.

484. Do you consider that an expenditure of £5,000 or £10,000 should weigh with the Legislature in securing for the settlers who may be isolated a thoroughly good education?—I do not think it should.

485. Would you be willing to raise the salaries of the country teachers so that the second and first assistants in towns should step into positions in the country?—I think nearly all our first and second assistants have had experience in country schools of various sizes. They are accustomed to the working of these schools, and also to the working of large schools; and it appears to me that the assistants of large schools who have had country experience should regard themselves as eligible for the headmastership of the middle class of schools.

486. With reference to the arrangement of the staffs in large town schools, do you think it is desirable that the arrangement should be settled by the Legislature in an arbitrary way, or that it should be left to the Board and their Inspectors?—If it were left to the Board to appoint males instead of females, if thought desirable, I should be satisfied; but I think you would need some general direction as to that.

487. Do you think the rent and house allowance should be continued as at present, or should it be included in the salary?—I think a house must be provided in the country, at any rate, and that the house should be habitable. In the past that has not always been the case here. Some of your country residences are not fit to live in in the winter-time.

488. Would it not be better to allow a man a certain amount of rent, with the option of renting the school residence from the Board or not, as he liked?—As a matter of fact, except in the larger villages or towns, the teacher would be compelled to rent the schoolhouse, for there is no other house available.

489. I presume, in some places the teacher must board himself with some of the residents?—In Otago, in almost every instance, there is a residence in connection with the school; but my point is that these buildings should be made snug and comfortable to live in.

490. Do you think it fair and reasonable that, in addition to the house and rent allowance made to the headmaster, a small allowance should be made to the assistants who may be married men?—I have thought about it, but I have not been able to make up my mind on that question.

SATURDAY, 18TH MAY, 1901.

DAVID R. WHITE examined.

Mr. White: I have been asked to represent the Educational Institute of Otago at this Commission, and I have very great pleasure in doing so. Though I have been out of connection with the Institute for some little time, I recognise that, having been asked by them to appear before you, I ought to do so. Our report has been printed, so that members may read it for themselves [Exhibit 55]. I wish to explain that the report was drawn up as a criticism of the scheme suggested by the Education Department, but as this scheme has been withdrawn the report is to some extent irrelevant and inapplicable. The Committee, however, in drawing up the report, have not confined themselves to discussion or criticism exclusively, but have laid down certain principles which will be of service to those engaged in recasting the present provincial systems of education. I will refer first to the pupil-teacher system, which is the basis of our national system. There are at present a thousand pupil-teachers in the schools of the colony. That number is far too large. The large numbers will be found chiefly in other educational districts. The first scheme recognises that so many pupil-teachers are a distinct source of weakness to our education system, and it proposes that the number should be reduced to 778, really 787, as the number was, by a clerical error, misstated in the first scheme. That, however, is unimportant. In the new or amended scheme it is proposed to reduce the pupil-teachers still further, and I understand that the number under the new scheme is stated as 680 pupil-teachers for the whole colony. This is a very great improvement on the present state of affairs, and also a considerable improvement on the first scheme, but the number of pupil-teachers is still too high as viewed from an Otago standpoint. The Institute recognise that the ratio should be in this way: one pupil-teacher for every 4·6 certificated teachers. I have studied the history of the pupil-teacher system in Otago for the last twenty years, and know that the ratio we have fixed is a workable, practicable ratio. At one time there were nearly 150 pupil-teachers in the Otago schools. There are at present only 82. When we had 150 we were training too many pupil-teachers. At the present number—that is, 82—we find that we are able to employ nearly all those who present themselves for certificates at the close of their training course. The amended scheme gives us 61 additional pupil-teachers for Otago—that is to say, under the amended scheme we should have in Otago 143 pupil-teachers. This would be overcrowding the Otago schools with pupil-teachers. We should not be able to find employment for them at the completion of their term of apprenticeship. The most important objections I wish to make to employing so large a number are these: (1) There will be no chance of vacancies occurring for them within a reasonable time; (2) there will be no proper opportunity of training so large a number; and (3) the quality of the work done in the schools would be inferior because of this undue proportion of pupil-teachers to certificated teachers. We must look to our training-colleges also for a supply of teachers. The training-colleges give us another source of supplying teachers, and we ought to keep the pupil-teachers at a sufficient point to allow of competition from outside by means of the training-colleges. This is another reason why I object to so large a number of pupil-teachers in the public schools. I do not depreciate, however, the pupil-teacher work where they are well trained, but to attach them as proposed under

the amended scheme—one teacher to one pupil-teacher—would be to staff the schools in a disproportionate way. This method of staffing the schools presupposes long, large rooms with a teacher in charge, and a pupil-teacher in attendance. This is a retrograde step. It is going back to the state of affairs in our schools twenty-five years ago. I will next refer to the placing of the pupil-teachers on the staff—their proper position. This is an important factor in determining the staffing of the schools. To my mind, they should be placed first in the infant department; then they should have control of small classes in Standards I., II., III., and IV. In this way they would gain power and control in managing classes—independent power. They would also get a more thorough grasp of the technique of teaching. These are important points in training pupil-teachers. I fear that these points will be overlooked under the proposed method of staffing the schools. The introduction of kindergarten work, it is said, will necessitate more pupil-teachers being employed. My answer to that is this: that when the Government has made provision for kindergarten work as a part of our national system of education it will be time enough to arrange our staff to suit the new order of things. One other reason which induces me to say we should keep our pupil-teachers at a lower point than that suggested is this: that pupil-teachers are easily obtained. There are always eight or ten times more candidates than vacancies, and in initiating a colonial system of staffing the schools it would be wise, I think, to keep on the safe side. The proposed number is, in my judgment, too great. I next consider the number of teachers required to staff schools. All my calculations on this point are based on Otago's statistics, and are made from an Otago point of view. In Otago we have required in the past, for new vacancies and retirements, at the rate of 5 per cent. annual increase on the roll of teachers employed by the Board. This rate of increase is not a mere guess. We have worked it out from our personal knowledge of the teachers employed in the Board's service for the past quarter of a century. I have looked at this question of the number of teachers from a provincial point of view in the first place, but I have also looked at it from a colonial point of view. This has been the basis of my calculation: Otago has approximately in her schools one-sixth of all the pupils in the colony. To multiply the attendance, the number of our pupil-teachers, and the number of our Otago teachers by six gives approximately the number for the whole colony. I know of no circumstances in the other provinces that would render this general conclusion invalid or unsound. The difference between the statements of the Institute contained in the report of the Institute and the statement or scheme of the Education Department is this: We have presented all our figures and shown our methods of calculation. The department has made a statement or scheme which was so unsatisfactory that it had to be withdrawn almost as soon as it was circulated. It could not stand criticism. I decline to commit myself to the amended scheme until it is put in complete and official form. At present it is unofficial and fragmentary. I suggest that when it is put in shape—after the Commission have completed their labours—the new method of staffing the schools should be again referred to the New Zealand Institute for further consideration. The first as well as the second scheme proposes a large increase in the number of teachers in Otago. I admit that in a few of the large schools we do require additional teachers; but I am strongly opposed to giving two certificated teachers to schools with an average of 35 as in the first scheme, or at 40 as in the second scheme. Adopting such a staffing as this would increase the number of teachers in the colony at one stroke by 250 additional teachers. Now, the Institute looks at this proposal from the point of view of teachers, judging of the efficiency of these small schools; and from the point of view of citizens, looking at the additional cost of salaries for these 250 teachers. They would cost, in round numbers, about £20,000 annually. As to the efficiency of these small schools, that has to be looked at first. The Inspectors in every district have for years past reported that these schools were, generally speaking, most efficiently managed. They have frequently said that the work is better than in the large schools. So far as efficiency, or inefficiency, is concerned, there would seem to be no necessity for these 250 additional teachers. I speak of the matter also from personal daily experience of a small school in connection with the training-college. It is just such a school as we are discussing. There are six or eight classes and about 40 pupils. My own knowledge of these shows me that the difficulties lie not in the number of classes, nor in the number of pupils, but the difficulty is confined almost exclusively to the syllabus of work, which the teacher has to undertake unaided. Any want of efficiency must be traced to these sources, and a simplification of the work of the small schools is what is required and was suggested at the recent conference of Inspectors. The amended scheme proposes to give 45 additional teachers to Otago, mainly for the small schools. The complete Otago staff would therefore stand in this way: 450 teachers and 143 pupil-teachers, as against the present staffing, 405 teachers and 82 pupil-teachers; or employing 106 more persons than are at present engaged in the public schools of Otago. I am of opinion that so many are not required. I will next refer to the method of payment of teachers. It ought to be made on a twofold basis: First, a minimum salary on the average attendance; and, second, an increment for length of service and efficiency of service—say, a £10 increment for every rank above the rank fixed in the minimum qualification. No other method of payment of teachers is, in my opinion, equitable. I wish now to make brief reference to the classification of schools. The scheme proposes no systematic classification of schools—at least, the principles upon which they are classified are not disclosed. For every arithmetical quota of 90 pupils or so there is an increase in staff, but that is all. The first principle in classifying schools should be this: At what point in the attendance should a headmaster be free from personal teaching of the standards? There are other principles, but there is no time to discuss them. I do not approve of large schools, nor do I approve of an abrupt rise or fall in the attendance affecting the salary to any appreciable extent. I do not approve of an automatic or mechanical method of classifying schools and making promotions. I also wish to refer to the minimum qualification for teachers. In fixing a minimum qualification for the smaller schools, a school of 75 requires a D1 certificate. This is far too high. The certificate could not be obtained

under eleven years' service, and could not be obtained unless a teacher received the highest possible Inspectors' marks. In conclusion, I wish to say that the intention of the framers of this colonial scheme is good. The scheme is only tentative; but to my mind it is inadequate, though undoubtedly a great improvement on the state of affairs existing in some of the provincial districts. I do not wish my criticism of the scheme to be taken in any personal way. I may say I have given these questions very great consideration. I probably know as much of these matters as most people, and therefore my individual expression of opinion is entitled to some weight. I was asked by the Institute on this account to represent their views. The full statement of our position is incomplete unless the report of the Institute, which has already been put in as an exhibit, is read in connection with my evidence. I thank the members of the Commission for their patient hearing and for the close attention they have given to my remarks.

491. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You have not considered the maximum salary?—No. We are not prepared to make suggestions, as we have not had time to look over the salaries.

492. You say the central department should take over all schools under 15?—I think that is quite possible. It is their duty, I think, to look after the settlers.

493. Do you think the central department would possess sufficient knowledge, equal to that of an Education Board, in dealing with these small schools?—Anything that was required might be laid before the central department by the Board.

494. Are you in favour of the central department superseding the Education Boards?—My principle in that matter is this: We ought to have what I call central supervision, but we ought to have local administration and full measures of local control.

495. Do you not consider that your suggestion to place so many of these schools under a central authority a distinct departure from that principle?—No. It is only in exceptional cases that schools would be placed under the central body.

496. Do you not think the position would be as well met by an increased grant being given to the districts where so many small schools are?—Yes; that might meet it in the same way.

497. Is not the handing-over of a number of schools to the central authority a step in the direction of centralising all schools?—Well, there are only a small number of pupils in the schools, and they are really not a part of the educational system. They are only provisional schools.

498. *Mr. Davidson.*] In considering this second scale, Mr. White, you agree with the staffing, except at the point where a mistress is allowed to be attached to the school at 40?—Yes, I think I agree with it as it is given there. If you will add that two pupil-teachers may be substituted for a teacher, and *vice versâ*, I think the staffing is very good.

499. That is, up to an average attendance of 330?—Yes.

500. So that the suggested scale, with the alterations noted, fits in nicely for the whole of Otago with the exception of thirteen large schools?—Yes.

501. Have you considered the question of salary?—No.

502. Do you approve of schools and position being classified in such a way that the assistants in certain schools will hold a corresponding position to the headmaster of a certain class of schools?—There ought to be some such principle as that, I think, for promotion.

503. You are familiar with the classification of schools at present obtaining in Victoria?—I am not very familiar with it. I have not looked at it for the last three years.

504. Perhaps you know that the objection taken to the Victorian scheme is its mechanical working?—Yes; but I thought that might be met by a minimum qualification for the position, and I do not know that it is necessary to go further.

505. If you could get rid of the mechanical working of such a scheme you think it would be a good one?—I think so.

506. Take Otago only: suppose a vacancy occurred in a second-class school, and the Board had the right to select the best man from the headmasters of third-class schools and the first male assistants in first-class schools, would not that get over the difficulty?—I do not quite understand what you mean by the Board selecting.

507. Suppose somebody had the right to select the best man from these two classes of men for promotion, independently of a mere mechanical list showing length of service, would not that get over the difficulty?—Yes, I think so.

508. You are fairly well satisfied with the staffing up to 330. If the staffing of the larger schools were somewhat on the principle suggested by the Institute, then you think it would be a fairly good solution of the difficulty of a colonial scale of staffing?—Yes. I should like to make the subject clear. We wish to state, as a principle, that there must be no increase in the second column, in the number of pupil-teachers. If any increase is required in the staffing of the schools it must take the shape of an adult teacher. We do not mind strengthening the staff of a school, but we do not want a multiplicity of pupil-teachers introduced. We do not want six teachers and six pupil-teachers, and so on, and my reason for objecting is this: that in such a system there is no proper way of training the pupil-teachers. The next objection is that you have not the means of giving them the control of individual classes, which they ought to have for some time at least. No pupil-teacher is properly trained who has not had the absolute control of a class. Let him find his power and authority. Under this proposal it seems to me we are returning to twenty-five or thirty years ago. We have been going ahead in Otago since then. We have been having our individual class-rooms smaller and our staff to correspond, and I do not think so many pupil-teachers are advisable. The new scheme, I take it, means that we are now going to have in our largest schools a competent trained teacher for Standard I., which is a most desirable thing; and, having that, we shall be able at times to take the pupil-teachers from the infant department, place the pupil-teacher in charge of Standard I., and put the assistant mistress in with the matron to do work there. That will be a great advantage in the general management of these schools.

509. Would you allow no assistance to a teacher until the average attendance reached 46?—No, I think not; but if you fixed the maximum at 50 I would allow temporary assistance a little

lower down. Take, for example, a school with an average of from 330 to 390: There is a great difference between the two, and what I propose is that when the attendance comes near to 390—say, 360, or up to 380—it ought to be competent for the teacher to ask for assistance; and it ought to be the duty of the Board to say, "You require temporary assistance for three or six months." That would be, on the whole, a more economical way than appointing some one permanently to do the work. It should apply to all classes of schools when the attendance was near the maximum.

510. How would you deal with the question of sewing-mistresses?—I have not thought of it.

511. *Mr. Stewart.*] You are of the opinion that the small schools are really the great difficulty in dealing with this question?—Yes.

512. Do you think the cause of many of the small schools is the result of pressure brought to bear on members of the Boards?—I have no personal knowledge of that.

513. You have not had evidence brought before you to that effect?—No.

514. You propose to put the small schools under the department?—Those below 14.

515. Do you not think that might result in a great deal of pressure—political pressure—with regard to the establishment of schools?—I am not versed in political ways, and cannot give an opinion on that point.

516. Did the system of bonuses satisfy the teachers of Otago?—Yes, I think it did; and I think it was well adapted for the purpose, and I am sure it secured the purpose in view—viz., the encouraging of many of our young teachers to secure higher certificates.

517. Mr. Pryde said this bonus system had given more trouble and dissatisfaction to the Otago Board than anything else: do you agree with that?—I do not know what trouble the Board has had.

518. But do you agree with Mr. Pryde's evidence, or do you not?—Mr. Pryde may have meant that it gave the Board a great deal of trouble in its finances, and I quite understand that, because there was a continual increment which was not easily calculable. He may have meant that the variable sum gave some source of trouble to their finances.

519. Suppose that system were extended to the whole colony, would it not be likely that it would also have the same effect on the colonial finances?—I do not know that it is a trouble or a difficulty; but Mr. Pryde may have thought it was a trouble.

520. If it is a variable quantity, would not the tendency be in that direction?—I do not think so.

521. You recommend a differential treatment of educational districts?—Yes; that has been considered a beginning in the way of meeting the difficulty.

522. Do you not think it would lessen the expense to the country if we had an amalgamation of small educational districts?—It strikes me in that way. The area of Boards might be increased in some districts, and the number of Boards might be reduced.

523. Would it be better to amalgamate districts or to have differential treatment?—As the object of the Commission should be, in the first place, not to disturb existing arrangements to any great extent, I should prefer giving the extra capitation allowance, and see how it would work out.

524. You would prefer local administration with central supervision: to what extent would you have central supervision?—Well, I will take this scheme, for instance. I think the Education Department is right in taking this in hand. They should draw up, within certain limits, conditions on which the staffing of the school should take place. They should submit these to the Boards, and say, "We will give you a certain amount of control within those limits." I should not have it said from the central department, "You must have that staff in that school," or any detail of that sort.

525. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you think the teachers in Otago receive a fair amount of salary?—I do not think they receive too much. If you look over the salary list of almost any system in the colonies you will find generally this principle: that the head of the school gets a fairly good salary. There is usually a deplorable falling-off in the salary of the first assistant, which is distinctly wrong. His salary should come well up to that of the head of the school. To pay him £150 is absolutely wrong. It is the commercial spirit to pay the head man £1,500 a year, and the first clerk comes in with about £5 a week, or perhaps £150 a year.

526. *Mr. Hill.*] I understand you generally approve of the staff recommended under the new scale?—I do.

527. Suppose that under the head of pupil-teachers there was an alternative given that in place of two pupil-teachers an assistant could be employed, do you think that would improve the scale?—As far as an individual school is concerned, it might be an advantage, but I would require to see the school itself before I could say. Of course, if the principle were carried too far we might have more pupil-teachers than adult teachers. That would be wrong. In Otago we have substituted two pupil-teachers, but it has in some schools been carried to excess, with the result that, while there was in the school the necessary staff according to scale, there was not the necessary number of persons to do the work well. I would suggest to the Boards that they should adopt this rule: that there should be not more than one pupil-teacher for every five certificated teachers in each province.

528. As to salaries, you think the salary offered to headmasters is a fair one under this scale?—I have not considered the question of salaries. I have no opinion individually, nor have I any opinion to offer on behalf of the Institute.

529. Do you agree to give to all teachers of the same classification the same pay?—Yes, practically that.

529A. Irrespective of the schools in which they are placed?—I would have the salary varying partly on the average attendance, the salary to rise with the attendance, and partly on length of service and efficiency as shown by the teacher's certificate.

530. Assuming that you have a number of teachers of the same length of service and the same rank, would you give them the same salary, although one was in a large school and another in a small school?—I do not think I would carry it to that extent. We should recognise that there is a difference in the size of the school, and therefore a difference in the responsibility. If you could manage a colonial scheme on that principle it would be an ideal scheme.

531. Has your Institute worked it out?—No.

532. Might I suggest that they should?—They might try. If the colony was prepared to pay on an ideal scheme I think it would be the right thing.

533. With the exception of the first assistant in your schools, is it not the fact that if you take the duties of the whole body of teachers outside the first assistant they are nearly on a line of equality as far as work is concerned?—Yes, I think so.

534. Is it not the fact that the number of pupils in charge of the junior assistant is equal to the number alloted to, say, the second master or the first mistress?—Yes.

535. And is it not the fact that in the matter of efficiency they are called on to produce results on lines of equality?—I think they ought to be even more efficient down there than above.

536. If that is the fact, how is it there are such wide differences in their salaries?—There ought not to be.

537. Then, you think that in the matter of staffing the large schools there ought to be a nearer equality in the salaries paid to the assistants?—Yes.

538. Do you not also think that, instead of requiring a first assistant master to hold a high certificate, it would be better to give a good salary to that master and send him into the country to take charge of a school, and have in his place a junior—that is, an assistant?—Yes. I think the first assistant's duties and responsibilities differ altogether. They are only class responsibilities, and, that being so, they are more restricted.

539. Do you not think the country masters are often driven into the town in consequence of trying to get a larger salary?—Yes; and the obvious answer is that you must make the salary in the country much higher.

540. Which would bring greater efficiency into the country schools?—Yes.

541. Coming now to the question of training, do you think the plan of receiving students into the training-school without having been pupil-teachers is a good one?—I have had some experience in the matter. I should not close the door of training-colleges absolutely, but I should take great care that only such numbers were admitted as would not materially interfere with the supply of teachers from a proper source—that of pupil-teachers.

542. You said you are having too many pupil-teachers?—I said we would be having too many under the amended scale. We should not train the number exactly, because that would be taking everybody who presented themselves; but we should have a certain margin, so that we would have a choice of selection, and take the best of the candidates so long as the number was not too large.

543. Would you explain what plan you adopt in the selection of candidates for admission?—An entrance examination is fixed by the Otago Education Board, and candidates are examined. There are not very many. The staff determines the examination, and recommends the Board that a certain number should be admitted. I have tried to keep that number down, on this ground: I have always been looking at the roll of teachers in Otago, and the number of vacancies likely to occur, and have fixed the percentage of entrances in that way.

544. How do you determine as to the matter of their technical skill?—They have none.

545. You admit them on their mental capacity?—Yes.

546. And you do not know whether they will turn out good or bad?—No.

547. And, if they turned out bad, what would you do?—Well, we ought to turn them out. I would like to explain with regard to the training-colleges. Mr. Hogben has the interests of teachers at heart in that respect too, and has officially stated that he will do something for training-college work. I may say I would like to see training-colleges established at Auckland and Wellington, as well as at Christchurch and Dunedin. I think it is an absolute necessity. As to whether they should be exclusively for pupil-teachers or not, that is a point for discussion. If Mr. Hogben wishes to take teachers from two different sources—pupil-teachers and training-colleges—he must make allowance for that. I should also like to say there are differences of opinion as to the efficiency of any pupil-teacher system. It has been called a cheap and inefficient system, and Mr. Mundella said the pupil-teacher system of England was the only blot on the education system of that country. Germany and France and a great many parts of the United States have no pupil-teachers; they say, "Have your training-colleges." I should not shut the door of training-colleges to young men or women in the colony who wished to become teachers, but I should take good care when they got in that they received a training, and also take this care, as exercised in Germany: that if a man or a woman did not come up to a standard of efficiency at a particular point he or she would have to leave.

548. From your long experience as trainer and teacher, would you suggest that young people should be trained under you before being sent to teach in the public schools, so as to avoid this great difficulty of the pupil-teacher system?—I recognise that the pupil-teachers as trained now in the public-school work are getting a very valuable experience of its kind. I have seen so many of them now that I must testify to their efficiency up to a certain point. I have also seen this: A student of my own has come and said to me, "Mr. White, I wish I had been under your training and directions four years ago, in order that I might have seen ideal work before I went into the actual work and did not know what the difficulties of teaching were." In a visit made to America lately a most distinguished educationist reported that what struck him as the difference between a purely training-college system and a purely pupil-teacher system was that the pupil-teachers appeared to have a ready confidence and control, and acquired that power much earlier than was common to teachers trained in normal

colleges. I think that is an advantage. I am not, therefore, in favour of simply a training-school course or simply a pupil-teacher course. I think we should have a four-years training as pupil-teacher and one or two years' training in a college, one or two of which should be passed in the university.

549. Do you think it right, Mr. White, that a raw boy or girl just passing Standard VI. should be placed to assist a teacher to train children in the country schools?—No, I do not know of its being done. Our candidates for pupil-teachership have in most cases reached almost a D certificate, and they are from sixteen or as high as eighteen years of age.

550. Would it not have been an advantage to the country to give them two years' special training before putting them into the public schools?—I do not know that that would be advisable. We have no pupil-teachers in our small country schools. That is the weakness you have in Hawke's Bay and Wellington, but in Otago we do not recommend it in our schemes. If we have a large school the pupil-teachers are put into the infant department under competent mistresses. Then they may in their second year, particularly if they are boys, be put in the First Standard, and in their third year in the Second Standard, alternating with the First Standard and the infant department, and when they are nineteen years of age some of them have all the sense they will ever have, and you may allow them to have some control of the Second or Third Standards. In that way, I have often to compliment pupil-teachers for the way in which they give their lessons. I can see many defects, but I look at their age and their experience and give them credit for the work they do, and on behalf of the Otago pupil-teachers I may say I think that as a class they have done most effective service. They have been earning really a capitation of £3 15s. a head, and yet the Board gives them the miserable pittance of £20 or £25 a year, and grudges them a bursary at the end of their four years' course at the training-college.

551. You think a special grant should be paid by the Government as a capitation allowance to the small schools throughout New Zealand?—That is, the schools under 14.

552. Do you think that in these small schools the people should be encouraged to give some portion of the salary?—Yes, I think so.

553. *Mr. Smith.*] What is your opinion about the two schemes suggested for the schools under 14—that of placing them under Parliament, or the plan of giving the Boards, where such schools are numerous, an additional capitation?—I should like to see the matter worked out. I would like to see the figures and the money that was available before I could say whether I preferred one to the other.

554. Irrespective of financial considerations, which do you think in principle is the better?—I think it would be better to increase the capitation allowance.

555. *Mr. Hogben.*] You have looked at the first scheme and at the alternative scheme I have submitted to the Commission, but you did not hear the statement made in reference to the alternative scheme, did you?—No, I did not.

556. The number of pupil-teachers with this alteration will be 680 for the whole colony, instead of 778; the number of adult teachers, instead of 2,999, will be 2,863: that being so, what is the proportion of adults to pupil-teachers?—It is 4·2 to 1.

557. It is not far from the limit named—4·6 to 1?—No; but there are still more pupil-teachers than we require.

558. Are you aware there are a great many pupil-teachers who pass the examination, but never enter the teaching profession at all?—Not so far as Otago is concerned.

559. I am speaking for the whole colony?—That may be so.

560. A good number go into the secondary schools?—Yes; I have taken all that into account in determining how many pupil-teachers will be required in Otago to fill probable vacancies. If i can be shown there are factors in the other provinces, so far as teachers are concerned, in which Otago is dissimilar from the rest of the provinces, there will be some reason for altering the ratio we have adopted for Otago.

561. Will you be surprised to hear that something like 203 are required every year to replace the drainage?—I am convinced, if it is so, it ought to be one-sixth of that number for Otago. Otago is one-sixth of the colony so far as average attendance is concerned, and in all our general calculations I have not forgotten that fact. I have said that, whatever is six times, Otago will give what is required for the colony in a general way of looking at it. I am sure that, taking one-sixth of this number—203—we have not vacancies for thirty-three teachers in Otago every year. I should like to see the figures taken out for the colony.

562. You admit that the figures you have given us are constructed on Otago experience and conditions?—Yes, that is so.

563. With regard to another point, you say that in schools of from 41 to 45 you would give a pupil-teacher temporarily?—No; I did not say anything of the kind. My own personal judgment is that when the attendance is from 46 to 50 there should be temporary assistance given—either a student or a pupil-teacher.

564. And how would you dispose of the pupil-teachers when the temporary assistance became unnecessary?—I should have a list of temporary assistants, as you have your list of relieving-teachers. If they were on the teaching-staff they would return to their school, or to any other school where a vacancy was occurring, for three months until they got a permanent appointment.

565. Are you aware that a very large number of those schools between 40 and 45 and 46 and 50 are fairly stationary? Why give them temporary assistance?—I have not said that with regard to any particular size of school. What I have said applies to a school of any size. If the school reached near to the maximum limit, assistance should be given to the school. At a certain point, when it became difficult to manage the school, I should make some arrangement for relieving the stress of work. As a temporary expedient it could easily be done.

566. Do you not think it would be better to staff the schools more strongly, and thus avoid the dislocating of arrangements in schools?—You will have that difficulty with any scale of

staffing you like to adopt. When the school comes up to the next higher class of school it will be in a difficult position so far as its staff is concerned, and will require additional assistance.

567. Do you not think it is desirable that you should exercise the principle you have expressed within as narrow limits as possible?—Yes.

568. And in that case would not a large part of the difficulty be met if the period for which the school was classified and for which the teacher's salary was calculated was, say, one year or two years?—Yes, I think so. I think the year would be best. I do not know how it would affect country schools. At any rate, it is not right that teachers' salaries should vary from quarter to quarter to any considerable extent.

569. It would give more stability to the salary to take one year or two years, would it not?—Yes.

570. You give that answer, I presume, making provision for a large increase in a school? If there was a large increase you would allow the teacher to reap the benefit of it?—Yes.

571. And if a decrease you would not lower the teacher's salary? I presume that period of one year or two years would allow the Board time to transfer him to some other school for which he was more fitted?—Yes.

572. You suggest that there should be a bonus instead of a deduction made?—Yes.

573. As far as regards the amount payable to the teachers for any one given period—teachers whose certificates were known—you recognise it would make the salary come to the same thing whether you paid a bonus or a deduction?—Yes; I suppose you would arrive at the same thing, but it would be operating on a wrong principle. One encourages teachers, and the other makes the "disgrace" implied by a reduction of salary, or, at any rate, it would have that appearance.

574. Another question comes in regard to the bonus: Would not the amount of bonus that might be payable be somewhat indefinite? It would be liable to increase?—Yes, in this way: the teachers might be promoted from class to class as they ought to be. There is this objection to the term bonus: Bonus is generally regarded as something you have not worked for. We want it to be known as an increase to salary for length of service and efficiency of service.

575. Do you not think it would be better to have all salaries fixed by attendance or by attendance and the status of the teacher, without having separate bonuses or separate deductions?—I do not think any colonial scheme of salaries should be based on average attendance only, nor do I agree with the deduction on a lower certificate.

576. Do you not think the fact that a higher certificate would give a teacher a higher appointment would be a sufficient stimulus to him to pursue his studies?—That depends on the classification you fix.

577. With regard to the classification of schools and teachers, such a system as you have yourself shadowed involves a centralised system, does it not?—I do not think so.

578. You have also considered the question of the organization in a school where the headmaster does a very large amount of teaching, and in a school where his work is practically confined to supervision?—Yes.

579. You are quite aware that the transition is comparatively gradual from stage to stage—that as a school becomes larger the master gets less and less teaching and more supervision?—The principle for classifying schools is this: I have drawn a line in your scheme at which I think the headmaster should be free from work, and I say it is not determined solely by any gradual increase, but in this way: by the size of the school to begin with, but by the number of classes in a given department of the school. My opinion is that the usual method of doing it is to give the headmaster Standard IV., V., and VI., and sometimes Standards III., IV., V., and VI., in the smaller schools. As these classes become larger he cannot overtake the work and supervise the school at the same time. It is not only the average of the school, but the size of the classes that determines whether the master shall be relieved. I have drawn it at that line—about 450.

580. There are a good many stages of transition before that stage?—Yes; but it is determined by the number of pupils in the upper standards, and not by the average of the whole school.

581. Before you reached that stage you would give an additional adult teacher?—Yes; or, at any rate, some assistance.

582. You would not put the small schools under the control of the department, would you?—I have not all the definite facts to make my opinion of any value, and therefore do not express it.

583. Do you think it would be necessary to have a safeguard against the multiplication of small schools?—Yes.

584. Otherwise, the finance of the whole scheme would be imperilled?—Yes.

585. There would be one difficulty, however—viz., as to whether you would carry the principle further than the small schools. A good many schools, as well as these small schools, do not pay on the £4 capitation. Would you carry it as far as those schools?—I have thought of that. I think it should be carried so far as to include such schools.

586. That would be three-fourths of the schools of the colony?—I do not know the facts, but that is what I would work up to.

WILLIAM EDGAR BASTINGS, representing the Oamaru Section of the Otago Branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Bastings: There were three of us appointed to lay our views before you, but owing to the time it would take up we have tried to condense what we have to say, and it has been put into the hands of one. Our feeling is that the Commission has a very friendly disposition towards us, and, while we may be criticizing one of the schemes, we are doing it in the spirit in which it behoves us to do it. We feel that these schemes put forward by Mr. Hogben are what riflemen call "sighters"—they have been thrown out, I think, to find the range, as it were. The North Otago

teachers approve of there being a colonial scheme of salaries, though they do not favour the first scheme presented. Under that scale it is plain that the salaries of Otago teachers as a whole will suffer a serious reduction if the proposed increase of staff be carried into effect. Now Otago schools admittedly occupy a high position relatively for quality of work. This surely argues that the system of staffing now in vogue in Otago meets the requirements in a very satisfactory manner. This being so, why should the staffing be increased, to the financial detriment of those already in the service? The staffing is not the trouble—it is the tremendously overburdened syllabus, the lightening of which would be a benefit alike to teacher and taught. It is suggested by the new scale to increase the number of pupil-teachers in North Otago from seven to nineteen. North Otago teachers do not desire this addition. A point for consideration in this connection is that supplying our schools with pupil-teachers would bring a great many more pupil-teachers into the service than could be employed ultimately. It seems to us wrong that young people should be trained as pupil-teachers if there be no reasonable prospect of their obtaining situations when they become certificated teachers. With regard to small schools, the staffing of a school of 35 with both master and mistress is regarded as altogether unnecessary. In a school of 35 the roll-number would probably be 40. There would be most likely about 22 in charge of the mistress, and about 18 in charge of the headmaster. These numbers are considerably below what teachers should be able to cope with. We do not think that increased assistance is needed at an average of 35. There have been many reductions in the salaries of Otago teachers of late years, with the result that since 1886 149 head-teachers and first assistants have left the service for other walks in life, so great has been the dissatisfaction. Under No. 1 scheme there is in North Otago an increase of £211 to teachers at present employed, and a decrease of £570. Fifteen males, whose salaries range from £150 to £200, will lose £360, or an average of £24 per head. How then will the new scheme attract the flower of New Zealand youth, or even keep the best men from leaving the service? As showing how unfavourably the profession is looked upon by young men in particular, consider the following fact: out of a total of sixty-nine candidates for pupil-teacherships in Otago last year only four were males. Here is an anomaly surely in the way of salaries: In a school of 19 an E5 teacher may gain £95, but if the average rises to 20 the salary will drop to £90, on account of the certificate-classification penalty. Now between E5 and E2 there is a great gulf fixed. It would take the teacher seven or eight years—probably more—to rise from E5 to E2. In schools of 19 to 35 the headmaster, if single, is required to pay £10 to a sewing-mistress. Has the bachelor-tax arrived? Is the principle of the headmaster paying any or all salaries a good one? We think not. In schools averaging 75 to 100 the new scheme would inflict a loss of from £26 to £33 per annum on headmasters, and £15 on mistresses, and this principally on account of the increased staff—in our opinion an unnecessarily increased staff. Regarding these same schools, it is the universal opinion that the required numerical coefficient (so to speak) of the certificate-letter is unreasonably high. This is a matter of special importance to Otago teachers, where it is a well-known fact that under the present arrangement the figure 1 can be attained only in comparatively rare instances. Again in these schools (75 to 100) the mistress's salaries will not compare favourably with those of sole teachers in smaller schools, and who are but beginners in the profession. Contrast these two cases: In a school of 19 the minimum qualification is E5, and the salary £100 and house. In a school of 96 the female assistant's minimum qualification is D3, and the salary £85 and no house. It is a fact that most mistresses and many higher assistants have themselves been sole teachers, and there is a strong feeling that their length of service should count for much more than it does in the scheme of salaries. The contention is not that the proposed scale for sole teachers is too high—we do not think so—but that the salaries of mistresses and assistants are too low. To establish this contention, witness what is paid as wages in trades and industries—to dressmakers, saleswomen, &c.—to say nothing of the earnings in the learned professions. Head-dressmakers receive salaries ranging from £3 10s. to £7 and £8 a week; milliners, £2 to £3 10s.; saleswomen, £2 10s. to £4. In all Otago there is only one position in which a mistress can attain to £180 per annum. The minimum wage for bootmakers has just been fixed at £2 10s., while carpenters and masons receive as much as 10s., 12s., and even more per day. Surely, then, a male teacher, with the qualifications required of him, should have a minimum wage of not less than £120. In schools of 100 to 150 the mistress, who has very much more responsibility and is much more experienced than the female assistant below her, receives but little more salary (mistress, £90; assistant, £80). There seems to be a great lack of proportion here; the mistress's salary is far too low. Teachers in general are not satisfied with payment on the average attendance. We are responsible for the training of every pupil on the roll, not for the average number; and, furthermore, it is the irregulars who multiply the work indefinitely and cause most of the trouble. We should like to see salaries paid on a basis similar to that of the Civil Service, the teachers being classified and paid according to classification. Once established on that basis, a superannuation scheme would become possible. Again, as regards payment on the average attendance, scattered settlement, local, climatic, and other conditions beyond the control of the teacher seriously affect the average. For example, look at the following cases: Kyeburn, average 24—62 per cent. of average roll; Arthurton, average 28—92 per cent. of the average roll. In the first-mentioned school the work is rendered of almost insurmountable difficulty by the bad attendance, and, as if this were not bad enough, the salary drops to a serious extent. Gentlemen of the Commission, you have had placed before you a careful statement of the wages paid in a number of callings. Viewing those figures, we think teachers' wages are inadequate, considering the length of the period of their training, the testing processes to which entrants are subjected, the responsibility of their work, and its peculiarly wearing nature. Of all workers the material wrought upon by teachers is of the highest, the consequences of their work the most important and most far-

reaching. It is the schoolmaster who stands between civilization and barbarism; who renders progress possible, and prevents retreat. For this high and noble work those of the highest aims and abilities should be secured. And how can the nation hope to secure these without offering them rewards commensurate with their services? Is not the labourer worthy of his hire?

587. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You said that an increase of staff was unnecessary. How many pupils would you give to a teacher on an average?—Well, I cannot say. We have not gone into this thing anything like Mr. White and his colleagues have done. I may say that the three North Otago delegates are separated by a distance of something like twenty miles. We have not the facilities for meeting that the city teachers have, so we have not made a general scheme, but I shall be glad to give an idea as far as I am able to do so.

588. You consider the staffing, so far as your experience has gone, sufficient here?—In Otago? I am inclined to say I think some amendment might be made. But I do not think 35 is the place for an assistant to come into a school.

589. In what schools have you had experience?—In schools of that class, averaging about 43. I am at present in a school with an average of 94, and, as regards this class of school, I do not care to have a pupil-teacher under the 100 mark. We would like to do as Mr. White has suggested, to get an assistant teacher at 100. There is one thing, though, I differ considerably from Mr. White about, and that is with regard to the place where the assistant should come in. I do not at all believe in the temporary teacher business. The line must be drawn somewhere, and the fact that a teacher is carrying on with very great difficulty till he gets into the next grade, as far as average attendance is concerned, would seem to show that the inter-spacing, so to speak, is too wide.

590. What is your opinion regarding the salaries paid in Otago just now?—I am inclined to think that the salaries paid to assistants in schools are too low, and the salaries of mistresses of country schools are too low. As regards the increase to teachers of country schools by the new scale, we think it is about the right thing.

591. That is the subsequent scale, not the original one?—Just so; that is, with regard to the small schools where there is a sole teacher.

592. You think the subsequent proposals satisfactory to the teachers?—As far as we have seen; but we have not had time to examine them. I have not gone into them.

593. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you seen the amended scale, or scale No. 2?—I may say I have not studied it. Time has not allowed.

594. But you have seen it?—I cannot fairly claim to have seen it. I have seen the papers—the figures—but have not gone through them.

595. The suggested scale here would be a considerable improvement in point of salary on the scale at present obtaining in Otago?—Generally speaking I should consider so; I could not answer definitely.

596. But when I tell you that schools at present from 14 to 19 are paid at the rate of £70, and here the suggested scale is £80 to £100?—That is evidently so.

597. Take the schools of from 40 to 65. The suggested scale is £160 for males: do you consider that a fair salary for that class of school?—I should think that a fair salary.

598. Did you notice, in scale No. 1, the salary allotted to the infant mistress in that school?—I did not.

599. The salary was £80, Do you consider £80 a year, for the mistress in that school, a sufficient salary?—I do not think so. My impression is that it should be £90.

600. Between 50 and 75 what is the salary paid at present to infant mistresses in Otago?—I could not say.

601. £85 is the salary; that suggested in No. 1 was £80, which meant a reduction of £5. The salary suggested in scale No. 2 is £90, which means an increase of £5: do you think £90 a fair salary?—I should think that would be about the minimum wage.

602. Taking the next grade of schools—65 to 90—what is the suggested salary under scale No. 2?—From £185 to £200.

603. Do you consider that a fair salary?—That is a fair salary. It is very much like that we have in force now; it is a trifle more liberal.

604. And very considerably better than is paid generally for such positions throughout the colony?—Yes. My impression was that the first scale of salaries for that grade was distinctly too low.

605. You have noticed that the suggested salary for infant mistress in that school has been raised from £90 in No. 1 to £100 here: is that equal to the salary at present paid in Otago?—I am inclined to think it is about the same.

606. Now, going back a little bit, and leaving the salaries for a moment, what number of pupils do you think a sole teacher can efficiently manage without any assistance?—Well, from 40 to 45. I have taught a school of 43 for a considerable time. It was pretty hard work; one had to be in vigorous health, and it kept one going from the start of the day to the finish.

607. You mean 43 was the average?—Yes, the average; though, as shown in the report given in, we do not think very much of calculating on the average when you wish to see what the work is.

608. However, you found very great difficulty in managing a school with an average of 43?—Not very great difficulty, but plenty to do; quite enough to do.

609. Do you think it would be too much for the average man?—I do not think so.

610. Do you think a woman could manage efficiently a school with an average attendance of 40?—Possibly. She would have quite enough to do. She would have, in addition to the work a man would have to do, to take the sewing. That would make a difference.

611. By the introduction of an assistant in the form of a mistress at 40 instead of 50, as at present, and the salaries of teachers not to suffer thereby, do you think the efficiency of education

in that class of schools would be increased?—I think so; but I am inclined to think that something between the two, say 45, would be about right.

612. But if funds will admit of getting the assistance of an assistant mistress at 40 instead of 45, do you not think the efficiency of education would be improved?—Possibly it would. I do not think the difference would be great.

613. You do not think the education given by a man teaching, say, twenty children from Standard III. upwards—he has got rid of Standards II. and I. and the primary classes—would be much superior when the man had only Standard III. and upwards to take?—Yes; there would be an improvement.

614. Do you not think that the efficiency of Standards I. and II. and the infants would be greatly improved by being in charge of a woman?—That is so.

615. Then you think, in the interests of education, apart from the financial aspect of the question, it would be better to introduce a mistress at 40?—I do.

616. Taking the next grade of school, the pupil-teacher is introduced at 90. What is the average of your school at present?—94.

617. What number are taught by the mistress in your school—give it approximately?—About 56, I should think.

618. How many divisions are there in your primary classes?—Three.

619. And she takes charge of the whole of the sewing?—Yes.

620. Do you not think it would be a distinct advantage to have a pupil-teacher to help the mistress in the infant-room—she has an average of 56, I think you said, and she has three primary divisions, and Standards I. and II.?—Undoubtedly it would be of assistance to her; but, looking at it from the point of view of the whole school, the work that would be necessary for training a pupil-teacher would, I think, more than counterbalance the advantages.

621. Leaving out of consideration the advantage or the disadvantage to the teachers, and considering the interests of the children only, do you not think it would be a very great advantage to have a pupil-teacher to assist the mistress in a school of that kind? Instead of having one teacher to teach 56 children you would have two?—It would be an advantage.

622. Then, if it can be managed—if the money will admit of it—you think it would be better to introduce a pupil-teach at 90 rather than run on to 100?—That is so, if it be possible financially; but, taking all things into consideration, I hold differently.

623. Do you know if in New Zealand pupil-teachers are introduced at 90?—No, I have no experience of it.

624. Take the next class, 120 to 150, in a school of two rooms, one in charge of a mistress having the children up to and including Standard II., and the other in charge of the master having all above Standard II.: in a school of 130, what would probably be the number taught by the mistress? It would need some consideration to figure that out.

625. Say, 70 and 60?—Those would be about the numbers.

626. Do you think the staff allowed here—two adult and two pupil-teachers—more than is required? Do you think the mistress should have some assistance in teaching 70 children in three or four preparatory classes and in Standards I. and II.?—Yes, she should have some assistance.

627. And do you not think it necessary the master teaching 60 in Standards III., IV., V., VI., VII., and may be an extra class, should have the assistance of a pupil-teacher?—I think it is, seeing he has the general supervision of the school.

628. Then, you think the staff in that division is sufficient?—I think so.

629. You have not had any experience in schools larger than that?—No, except as a junior assistant.

630. *Mr. Stewart.*] I believe you are the official representative of the Oamaru sub-branch of the Otago District Institute?—That is so.

631. How many members are there in your sub-branch of the Institute?—About thirty-six.

632. Are they mostly country teachers of medium-sized schools?—Mostly country teachers.

633. Does your branch approve of the adoption of a colonial scale?—Yes.

634. As a principle, you are quite agreed upon the necessity of a colonial scale of salaries?—We are.

635. How long have you been a teacher in Otago?—My period of training commenced about 1884.

636. Would you approve of a bonus system being added to the colonial scale of salaries?—I am not very sure about a bonus system. It was in operation in Otago before, and I do not think it worked too well.

637. Was it not a general matter of complaint that the bonus system operated badly?—Well, it appeared to work in this way: that as more and more teachers rose up to the bonus class it became more and more difficult to find the funds for them; and they had hardly become eligible for a bonus before the qualification was raised and the bonus was cut away from them.

638. In other words, it was a disturbing element in finance?—It was. The only fault with it seemed to be its impossibility.

639. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider, on the whole, that the teachers of the colony are adequately remunerated for their services?—I think we are very much under-paid.

640. You stated, in reply to Mr Davidson, that you thought about 40 would be about as many as a sole teacher ought to deal with?—I think about 40 would be right for a female, or 45 for a male.

641. You consider a female teacher can efficiently teach up to 40?—I think so.

642. When asked by Mr. Hill, a neighbouring teacher said, "I do not think a woman should be asked to teach more than 35?"—I think I have overstated it. Perhaps it would be better to have a male teacher after 35.

643. Do you think a female teacher is able to teach 30 pupils as well as a male?—I think so.

644. And you would be in favour of giving the same rate of pay?—I would not. Excuse my abruptness. It is a subject upon which I hold a very decided opinion. While hoping to see the ladies well paid, and wishing to see a reasonable minimum, I do not believe in the principle of equal pay. If you go on the basis of a living-wage, I think that a living-wage for a man and his wife and family, perhaps of eight or ten, is a very different thing from a living-wage for a single girl.

645. But you would be in favour of minimising the disparity between the salaries paid to male and female teachers—to lessen, as it were, the difference between the salaries paid. For example, in Southland the male teachers are only paid 10 per cent. more than the female teachers?—I do not think that difference is sufficient.

646. Do not you consider that the greater freedom of classification and grouping that is adopted in schools just now enables a teacher to teach efficiently a number more than he was formerly able to teach?—That is quite so.

647. Then, you consider that the teachers you represent would prefer to do a fair amount of work, and to get a fair salary, rather than have the staffing of their schools increased and the salary diminished?—You have exactly stated their opinion.

648. With regard to the working average, from your experience do you consider the working average limit of 50 per cent. too low—that is to say, that half the roll-number should be absent before the working average operates?—I consider it decidedly too low—altogether out of the way. It is only in exceptional cases, and in very scattered districts, that there is any use in having a working average.

649. Do you consider, comparing the work done by an assistant in a large school, that his work is by any means as arduous as that of the country teacher with all the standards to teach unaided?—It is a little hard to compare them. I think there is a difference in kind. The country school-teachers do a great quantity of work in the limited time at their disposal for each subject; and the assistant at a town school has very much easier work as far as teaching goes, I should say, because he has more time to take each subject; but the disciplinary strain upon him must be more severe.

650. Is there a tendency in your district for successful teachers in the country districts to gravitate towards the town, rather than for assistants to go to the country schools?—Such a tendency is very marked, and there is, among many others, a reason for it that has not been touched upon at all as far as I know—they wish to get to town for the sake of attending the university and improving their status.

651. Do you consider more encouragement should be given to teachers of country schools by the way of increasing their salaries, so as to encourage those who have been assistants in town schools to go into the country and gain experience in the management of a school?—I am quite of that opinion. Being a country teacher myself, it might be regarded as an *ex parte* statement, but I am of that opinion apart from that altogether.

W. C. Macdonald, President of the Otago Branch of the Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Macdonald: We wished that Mr. White should take up the presentation of the prepared statement, on account of his wide experience and well-known ability among us. We also apportioned amongst ourselves different parts to deal with. I may say that I was asked to take up this question of payment on a capitation basis, and to put before you our views on that subject. At the last election it was brought prominently before members of Parliament, and they were almost unanimously in favour of increasing the capitation allowance. We understood this capitation was coming to the Otago Board; but we find, on looking at the scale proposed, that, for a number of the Boards with a large proportion of small schools, such as Westland, Marlborough, and some others, the £4 capitation is not sufficient, and that other Boards must have a certain amount deducted in order to make up the deficiencies in that respect. We have not worked the figures out in connection with it, but we were wondering whether we were actually getting, under the new scale, the £3 15s. we were getting formerly. Any way our suggestion regarding this is embodied in the report. It is, that the districts referred to should get an increased capitation, because, supposing we got the proposed scale of salaries on the £4 capitation, we do not know but that in a year or two there may be a revision of the staff. If there is a revision it would probably come through smaller schools being established, and we know that the cost of such smaller schools will certainly be more than the £4 capitation, and that would mean probably another reduction of salaries in a few years time. To meet that, of course, special capitation will be required for the weaker districts. I may say, gentlemen, that the members of Parliament here will, of course, recognise that the multiplication of small schools has come about on account of the expansion of our land policy: this buying up of estates for closer settlement leads to the establishment of small schools. This operation of the land policy is bound to be extended, especially in the North Island, where the trunk railway is being made and Native lands are being acquired for settlement. There must consequently be a large number of small schools established, and, that being so, on the £4 capitation basis we are bound to be reduced. On the other hand, we contend that, if there is to be a capitation to the Boards, it is not fair to make it on the average attendance. Each of the Boards at the present time we know has to provide accommodation, not on the average attendance, but upon the roll attendance; every building must accommodate the roll attendance, and we have to teach them. At the present time the Boards are not paid on the number taught, nor do the teachers receive salaries for the number taught. In the case of a school with a roll of 100, perhaps the average will be 80; but, while the teacher is paid for 80, you will find present, when the Inspector comes to hold an examination, an attendance of 98 or 99, and the teachers are held responsible for teaching that number. The Board gets paid only for 80. If there is to be capitation payment, it ought to be on the roll-number and not on the

average attendance. We do the work, and feel that we ought to be paid for it. We hold that, if there is to be sooner or later a colonial system of staffing and salary, it should not be *per capita*; it should be by a block vote. We can find no other country or colony where the education vote is *per capita*. Then, if we come to the question of cost, it behoves us as teachers, and also as taxpayers, to try and cheapen the cost without impairing the efficiency of our service. Now, we have gone over the report, and I will read very shortly, as I know your time is limited, a number of schools we have taken out of the report, and will mention how we propose that some of them should be dealt with. In Marlborough there are thirty-one schools averaging 3 to 10; Nelson, twenty-one, with an average of 3 to 10; Grey, six, with from 6 to 10; Westland, thirteen, from 4 to 10; Hawke's Bay, one of 9; Taranaki, four, from 8 to 10; Auckland, thirty-one, from 5 to 10; North Canterbury, five, from 7 to 10; Otago, seven, from 6 to 10; and Southland, six, from 8 to 10. That is, there are 147 schools with an average attendance of from 3 to 10. Now, we contend that in that large number of schools there must be some where the colony could dispense with the buildings required, and the expense of the maintenance of the schools, by the conveyance system. By this system these children could be carried to schools within range, and so there must be some of this large number of small schools—147—that could be done without. Our own Board is now trying this system, and is carrying a number of scholars to schools, and I think I am right in saying that it is going to extend the practice. This has enabled it lately to close some of the small schools. This principle might be extended throughout New Zealand with a very large saving in the expense of education without impairing the efficiency of education—in fact it would improve it. In our own district I think the practice might be extended. On looking over the report I find that on the Otago Peninsula there are ten schools. It seems to me that is a large number for the Otago Peninsula. Then between Dunedin and Port Chalmers, only nine miles, just on the railway-line, with twenty-two trains up and twenty-two trains down a day, there are three schools. Now, there cannot be the slightest doubt we are building too many of these schools. In Oamaru we have the North School, the Middle School, and the South School, where two schools would supply all that is required, without those schools being at all above the average. There would be two schools of probably 500 pupils, and, as a matter of fact, the Waitaki Girls' High School would like to get the central building. Quite lately there was a school built unnecessarily in Dunedin. I refer to the school at St. Clair. That was built alongside a school with an average of 400 or 500, not at all an unwieldy school, with all the pupils just alongside it, and yet we have a new school at St. Clair. These are the only cases that have come under my own knowledge; but I think, sir, if you wish to get information in cases of this sort, as to whether conveyance is possible, the gentlemen to consult would be our Inspectors, because they are so intimately acquainted with the topography of the district. A gentlemen like Mr. Goyen, who has had over twenty years' experience in the district, will know whether any such cases have arisen in Otago, and I am sure that in the other districts the Inspectors would be able to give you any information you require on this subject. With regard to the block vote for education, what we feel is that we are doing important work, probably more important work that any other department of the public service, and we think we ought to be adequately remunerated for that work. If the capitation of £4 is the limit of the amount that is to be devoted specially for this purpose, we think we should not be so limited. Surely the colony at the present time, with its boast of a surplus of half a million, can spare a few thousands towards giving adequate remuneration to those doing so important a service in our colony.

652. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I take it you would like the present grant of £4 to remain for old provincial districts like Otago, but that there should be a special increase in the grants to work up schools in the weaker districts to a standard something like Otago's?—That is so, provided the grant is on a capitation basis.

653. But you would prefer a lump vote for schools?—We would prefer that.

654. You alluded to the number of small schools in some other districts. If Otago had not shown some back-bone, might not Otago have had a very large number of these very small schools too?—I think so; but I think that all along the Education Board has set its face against increasing the number of small schools, and very wisely too.

655. You alluded to the economy of dispensing with a number of these school-buildings; perhaps you are not aware that most of the small schools in Nelson and Marlborough are really in households that are provided by the people whose children are being taught?—I was not aware of that.

656. Have you given that question of conveyance much thought?—Well, I know the system has been adopted in Victoria, and that in the districts where it exists—the farming districts—the farmers get the contract amongst themselves to convey, and there they prefer this to having a school, because when the children are taken in conveyances they can attend far more regularly. It is found to be of great advantage.

657. Is there no point at which they begin to convey them?—I think they convey them for five miles: all the distance.

658. But at what point would you begin to convey the children? You surely would not propose to convey all to the school?—Oh, no, from about three miles.

659. You think a point could be fixed, and that you could withstand the pressure that would be brought to reduce it to two miles, or a mile and a half?—I think so. That would be making "molly-coddles" of the children.

660. You alluded to the three schools on the Port Chalmers line; how would you work that?—I think if one of those schools had not been established there, the children would have gone by the railway-line to the nearest school, and of course they travel on the railway free. I think the numbers could conveniently have gone to either school.

661. Would it have been St. Leonard's?—Yes.

662. And they could have been taken to Sawyer's Bay or Ravensbourne?—Yes.

663. *Mr. Davidson.*] You have had considerable experience, Mr. Macdonald, as a teacher. Would you state your experience?—Well I was for a number of years on the permanent relieving staff in Victoria, and I then had experience in schools of from 20 to 1,400. In New Zealand I have been first assistant in Albany Street—I think about 600—and acting headmaster of the Oamaru North School—about 300 or 400. Then I was headmaster of the Otepopo School of 120, and now I am headmaster of the Ravensbourne School, of from 200 to 220.

664. What is the present average attendance of Ravensbourne?—207.

665. And your salary?—£249.

666. Your staff?—A mistress, assistant, and two pupil-teachers.

667. The salary of the mistress?—I think £115; it was £120.

668. Of assistant?—£85, if I recollect aright.

669. Under the suggested scale, what would be the staffing of the school?—I think another assistant would be granted.

670. The matron would take the infant-room?—Yes.

671. What is the average attendance in that room?—Perhaps 70 or 74; there will be 80 on the roll.

672. What assistance has she?—A pupil-teacher.

673. What classes has she?—A small First Standard and the infants.

674. What assistance?—A pupil-teacher, with another teacher, of course, to assist occasionally.

675. What does the other assistant take?—The Third and Fourth.

676. Can you give me, approximately, the average attendance of the Third and Fourth?—About 50, I should suppose.

677. And who has charge of Standards V., VI., and VII.?—I have charge of them myself.

678. Any assistance?—No; the pupil-teacher takes Standard II.

679. About what is the average attendance in the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh?—About 50.

680. What is the average attendance in Standard II.?—About 27.

681. The suggested staff in scale No. 2 I find here is: headmaster, infant mistress, two assistants, and two pupil-teachers; that is a staff of six in a school of between 200 and 250: do you think that staff is sufficient?—Yes; I think, more than sufficient. I do not need two pupil-teachers; I think one pupil-teacher is quite sufficient, with the extra assistant.

682. Take a typical school of, say, 230: how would you staff that school?—Approximately, I would put the mistress and a pupil-teacher for the infants, the first and second assistants to the First and Second and Third and Fourth Standards, and the Fifth and Sixth would be in charge of the headmaster.

683. Admitting that frequently the number in the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Standards would be 55?—I do not think that would be too many for the headmaster to manage.

684. Do you not think it would be very much better if the headmaster had the assistance of a pupil-teacher in dealing with the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh, so as to give him more freedom for classifying, organizing, supervising, and examining the school?—I have no doubt that if he could manage to have a teacher for every 20 or 30 it would be an advantage; but I think, looking at the financial aspect of the question, we must cut our coat according to our cloth, and we are content to do the work if we get the pay. In other parts of New Zealand the teachers complain that we get higher salaries; but we do more work, and are willing to do it.

685. I think you know I have been one of those who have contended that that is so; but what I want to get at is: do you admit that where there is an average attendance of 55 in sole charge of the master of that school, in the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh, apart altogether from the financial aspect, if the Government of the colony will give us this staff, and pay a rate of salary equal to that obtaining in Otago, would it not be entirely in the interests of education, in the interests of the children, that we should have that increase of staff?—Undoubtedly, if they will give us the staff and the pay we require we shall be quite content.

686. We have to study not only the interests of the teachers, but the interests of the children, and what we want to get at is this: would it not be better for the children if the master of such a school had a certain amount of freedom, so as to pay greater attention to the whole supervision of the school than he can under the present conditions?—Well, there is no doubt the freer a master is to supervise the work of the school the better it will be for the school.

687. Under the new regulations, where the examination of the whole school is thrown upon the headmaster, do you not think that his work is materially increased?—Immensely, undoubtedly.

688. Then, if the work is increased, do you not think he should have increased assistance? That holds, I think, only in Otago.

689. I am taking the whole colony?—I do not know that it is necessary under other Boards to examine quarterly, and to provide parents with quarterly returns of examinations. That is only under this Board.

690. I know it is not a regulation; but is it not necessary, in the interests of the children, that teachers should examine quarterly?—But not necessary that every child should have a return of the results.

691. Since that is so, do you not think that masters should have more assistance?—I am quite sure that since the regulations came in I could find work for two assistants if I could get them.

Mr. Davidson: Under the new scale you would have the assistance of a pupil-teacher. That would enable you to get about the school.

692. *Mr. Stewart.*] You are president of the Otago Branch of the Institute?—Yes.

693. Are you in favour of a colonial scale for the payment of teachers?—Yes; we are in favour of a colonial scale for the payment of teachers, but not the tentative scheme put forward.

694. As a matter of principle, you are in favour of a colonial scale?—As a matter of principle, we should like to see the rest of the teachers of the colony raised up to our level.

695. *The Chairman.*] But you do not want to be "raised down to their level," do you?—No; we do not want an Irishman's rise.

696. *Mr. Stewart.*] What I am wishing to get an expression of opinion from you upon is this: if there is a colonial system, should there not be a colonial scale of remuneration?—Oh, yes.

697. You object altogether to the capitation basis for the payment of teachers?—We object to the capitation basis as proposed, and think it ought to come as a block vote, for the reasons we have given. I need not go over the ground again.

698. Is the tentative scale drawn up on the capitation principle?—We had a difficulty there. It mentions schools below 14 are to have capitation up to £5. We did not know whether that was included in the £4, or whether it was proposed to grant £5 separately.

699. *Mr. Hogben.*] It is included in the capitation?—We must have overlooked that.

700. *Mr. Stewart.*] That makes it clear that districts with a large number of small schools will get more than £4 capitation?—Yes, they must.

701. Do you think the extinction of these small schools of distinct value educationally, apart from any other question?—I believe in the extinction of these small schools where possible, because their work could be better done in schools of a larger size.

702. But, supposing there were two schools of 40 pupils each, and you amalgamated them and had one of 80, do you think the educational work would be better done?—Certainly.

703. Do you approve of such a proposal as that brought before the Commission yesterday—namely, that schools of from 45 to 70 should be paid at the same rate as schools below 45?—No, I do not.

704. Why not?—I think teachers going out—young, able-bodied, energetic men as a rule—have to make a start in their profession, and I think they should start in those schools, and that they should not receive the same payment as those who have advanced. I recognise that in the higher classes the work may be very difficult; I recognise that in these schools the work may be more severe than even the headmastership of a large school, but I think there must be a gradual rise in the profession; and I think that in this class of schools they should start in their profession, and that the salaries should not be the same. They should look forward to a higher salary at the next step. I think the salaries should be graded.

705. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] In regard to the proposed scale No. 2, do you consider that it is time to bring in assistance to a sole teacher when the attendance goes above 40?—We debated that, and I fancy the Commission might have got a wrong impression from a previous statement. We had a number of teachers before us who said that when it got near 50—I may explain that now, in Otago, we bring in assistance at 50—they felt that the work got very heavy, and that some assistance was required; and they said, at the same time, that the difficulty arose not so much from the number of pupils as from the number of subjects that they had to take. In order to meet their requirements it was unanimously decided that at 46 we should introduce assistance.

706. And the assistance that would be given then would be by way of the appointment of an assistant teacher, not by a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

707. And do you consider it early enough to bring in a pupil-teacher when perhaps the attendance reaches 90?—No; we would not bring in a pupil-teacher there either.

708. Not till it reaches 100?—No; then we would bring in another assistant. In the smaller schools we think the addition should be an assistant.

709. Does your Institute favour the equality of payment, or as near as possible the equality of payment, of male and female teachers for doing the same class of work?—Well, we do not think they are ever doing the same class of work, except in the smaller schools. And we do not favour equality for this reason: we think more encouragement should be given to males to enter the service, because, as a rule, males take it up as their life's work, while female teachers do not. We find that, taking a period of fifteen years, 80 per cent. of males remain in the service, but only 20 per cent. of females. On these grounds we thought there should be encouragement given to males; but at the same time we fixed a minimum wage, as you will see by our report.

710. I think that in your address to the Commission you advocated the payment of teachers according to classification of schools, or the attainments of the teachers, rather than on a *per capita* attendance?—We made the average attendance the basis, but efficiency and extra service should also be recognised.

711. You think that the teachers should be paid according to the position they hold and the work they do rather than *per capita* on the average attendance: was not that just your report?—No; that the general vote should be not *per capita*.

712. I understand that; but I inferred from your remarks that also the teachers should be paid by the class of schools taught rather than by the average attendance?—On both.

713. Has your Institute passed any resolution with regard to the centralisation of Inspectors—Yes; that has been approved of both by the Institute and Council—the centralisation of Inspectors.

714. I suppose you are aware that the Inspectors themselves, at their conference, passed a resolution in favour of centralisation?—I understand so.

715. With regard to superannuation and retiring-allowance, are the teachers of Otago in favour of a scheme for providing superannuation or retiring-allowances?—The matter has not come officially, as it were, before the teachers; but the majority of them—at any rate, a number of them—are in favour of a superannuation scheme. But it has not come officially before the Institute; I do not put that forward as coming from the Institute; and I might explain, Mr. Chairman, that a line

should be drawn here between matters that are personal opinions and those that are the opinion of the Institute. I do not wish to put forward my own personal opinions as the opinions of the Institute.

The Chairman: We fully understand that.

716. *Mr. Hill.*] You agree, I understand, with the principle of a colonial scale; but do you agree also with a colonial scheme of promotion?—Yes, undoubtedly. That is one of the great grievances of the profession. A number of able men have left the profession through dissatisfaction on that score—that there is no recognised system of promotion.

717. I understand the Institute is of that opinion?—I will not put that forward as the opinion of the Institute. We have not debated the subject lately.

718. It is your personal opinion?—Yes.

719. You have been telling us that 50 children are quite enough for the most efficient teacher to control?—I did not say that, sir.

720. Well, do you think that 50 children should really be considered the maximum put to any teacher?—No, I do not. I think that, under some circumstances, in single classes they can manage more, and, as a matter of fact, they do. Some Dunedin assistants, and the second and third assistants especially, have a far larger number.

721. Is not that teaching collective instead of individual?—There is not much time for individual teaching.

722. Which kind do you prefer, individual or collective?—Oh, individual, undoubtedly, if possible.

723. Then, the more collective the less effective the teaching must become?—Undoubtedly.

724. What would be the proportion in a school of 100 that would be likely to be in the standards?—It would differ materially; you would not get two schools alike.

725. What would you consider a fair number, say, in the preparatory classes?—I do not know that you are taking altogether a fair case. Directly it rises over 100 we propose another assistant.

726. I will take your school as an example. You tell me you have a school with an attendance of over 200?—Yes, about 200.

727. Now you have no assistant master there?—There is no assistant master.

728. You have two mistresses there, I understand: do you think that the substitution of an assistant master say, at 176, would not strengthen the school?—I have no doubt that it would.

729. Then, you would say that a headmaster, an assistant master, a first mistress, a junior assistant mistress, and one pupil-teacher would be a more efficient staff than that which is now supplied to you?—Undoubtedly, if you increase the teaching staff you must increase the quality of the teaching.

730. Then that staffing is better than the staffing you have at the present time?—It must be better.

731. That is the staff recognised in Hawke's Bay to-day; but do you not consider the staffing proposed under the regulations would tend to improve the condition of your school—I am dealing simply with the staffing?—If you gave a teacher to every 20 or 30 pupils it would be an advantage.

732. If we can find a basis for staffing, possibly we shall find a basis for paying?—But you contend that the more you increase the staff the more you must increase the efficiency of the school.

733. I am quoting from the present staffing, and I am simply giving the staffing which is before me as the one that is at present in operation, and another that is proposed by the department. That is all. I am simply putting these things before you. The great point we have in view is to make the schools efficient in the first place. What did you mean, Mr. Macdonald, when you said just now that you think there should be a block vote for education? Will you explain that a little bit more? There is a block vote now?—Well, that the salaries should be remunerative right through New Zealand; a fair reward for work done; and that the vote should be voted as a whole simply, not fixed on a *per capita* basis. To say we will vote £4 *per capita* throughout New Zealand, and you will have to do with it, I do not think is treating a large and important department fairly. They do not do that in any other department.

734. Upon what principle do you propose that teachers shall be paid? In my opinion, there is a means of paying by promotion; a means of paying on the average; a means of paying for length of service; a means of paying for efficiency; and a means of paying for nothing?—We never had the latter in Otago.

735. I am satisfied of that, Mr. Macdonald?—I should say, supposing you fixed a scale of salaries making payment on average attendance one part, and payment for efficiency and services another part, when you had made that scale out for the whole colony the vote should be for that amount, and not on a capitation basis, the same as it is in the other colonies.

736. Now, taking a concrete example: suppose there were two masters in charge of schools of similar number—one has been a master for ten years, another for twenty, and that they have the same ordinary qualifications—would you give the same salary to the man who has been a schoolmaster for ten years that you would give to the man who has been a master for twenty years: would you give anything for length of service?—Undoubtedly I would; and I think that if pay were given for length of service and efficiency that would end so much of the cry about country schools. If the salary depended upon efficiency and length of service many a man would be content to remain in the country, but where it depends upon average attendance there is a constant drifting-away from the country, and on that score the country teachers do not stay as long as they otherwise would.

737. You spoke just now of payment being made on the roll-number: would you not rather suggest the number present at all during the week—I mean to say on the highest number present during the week?—That would be a fairer system than the present.

738. You see, the teacher has been present to do the work, but the pupils were away. The highest number present at all really represents the number of pupils whom he has taught during the week. You would suggest that that, in preference to the roll-number, should be accepted as the basis?—We would far prefer that to the present average attendance. It would be more equitable than the present system; but even the highest number present during the week would not give the number actually taught. For the children on the roll we are held responsible; we have to teach them; and, as a rule, it is generally found that all will be present when they have to go through their annual examination, or anything of that sort. So that we contend we should receive some return for these, or that the Boards ought to get something *per capita* for them.

739. You do not propose to give the same salary to all the teachers who have the same classification, irrespective of school?—No, I would not do that.

740. Do you recognise that women should have the same salaries as men, in schools below, say, 20 or 25, supposing they are doing the same kind of work?—Schools below 30 should be confined pretty well to women.

741. That is my view of the case. You would confine schools of 30 to female teachers?—Yes.

742. And above 30 you would place a male teacher?—I do not know; about 30—say, from 35 to 45.

743. Would you limit the women really to schools below 35?—Yes, I think so, as sole teachers.

744. As assistants in the larger schools we saw working very well the other day lady assistants, and they had some large classes, as large as the male teachers: do you think they should have the same salary for doing the same kind of work?—They do not do the same kind of work.

745. In what does it differ?—Where they do the same kind of work I think the males should have a proportionately higher salary, but the rule, I think, is the other way. The second assistants here are female, and third assistants male. The third assistants have the Fourth Standard, and the second assistants the lower standard. The third assistants do not get the pay of the second assistants.

746. But in the ordinary distribution of the staff should you not put them where they are best adapted?—Undoubtedly.

747. Does it always follow that a mistress capable by past study of taking charge of Standard III. would be best suitable for the infants?—No.

748. Would you not bring to a more general average the salaries paid to that class of teachers?—No, I do not think so. Take the case of the male assistant: he takes charge of the upper classes of the school, and in case of the headmaster's absence he has charge of the school. I would approve of the second assistant being a male and taking charge of, say, the Fifth Standard, or, in a large school, the third being a male and taking charge of the Fourth, because I hold that in schools where the classes are large the physical strain is too heavy for a woman. I may say that the ladies on our Committee went with us in this. They were not in favour of equality of payment, but thought that they should be paid higher salaries than they were receiving, and that is our opinion.

749. *Mr. Smith.*] In alluding to the number of small schools you said they were an evil?—I do not think I said they were an evil.

750. The question asked was if they were an evil, and you said "Yes"?—I think you must have misunderstood me. I said the work could be better done in larger schools if you could get the children to the larger centres.

751. Are you aware that most of these small schools in Marlborough are situated in the Sounds, at places where it would be utterly impossible to get the children within reach of other schools?—I wonder if it is not possible for the majority to handle an oar, and to pull across to the nearest point.

752. It is clear you have never lived there, or you would not have made that suggestion. If you knew the violence of the wind you would not have thought of it. You do not consider it an evil to give the children of poor settlers in outlandish places, where it is impossible to establish large schools, a modicum of education?—No; on the contrary, my opinion was that in a number of places it must be possible to get them by means of conveyances to other schools. That is why we contend the education vote should not be *per capita*, but a block vote for the colony.

Mr. Smith: With regard to the thirty-four schools in Marlborough, such as they are, they are without house accommodation except that provided by the parents, who find board and lodging for the teachers, so that the parents have to do something.

753. *Mr. Weston.*] Would you in any manner alter the syllabus for the smaller schools?—I have always contended that the syllabus should be altered for the smaller schools.

754. In what way?—In the demands. I would not like to go over it just now. Not in the essentials of education—not in reading and writing. Perhaps some of the arithmetic might be cut down conveniently in all schools, but such a subject as history could be taken as a reading-lesson; less might be required in geography, and perhaps classes might be grouped more.

755. One more question: do you think boys and girls can receive in general country schools sufficient education as pupil-teachers?—I think they receive sufficient education, especially here in Otago, where we have paid high salaries. We have a fine class of men in the country schools as headmasters, who can not only do that, but can qualify them for matriculation.

756. You think that the country teachers have not only the education but the time to properly instruct pupil-teachers?—I do not know about the matter of time; I think they hardly have the time, but they make it. I do not know where you propose to introduce a pupil-teacher.

757. Well, I asked the general question: you say that the masters have the ability to teach, but it is questionable whether they have in some instances the time?—Oh, they have the time wherever we have a pupil-teacher, certainly.

758. *Mr. Hogben.*] I think that you are aware that in the alternative proposals all the salaries of assistants, male and female, are brought up to a scale not lower than that existing anywhere in the colony?—You mean to the Otago level?

759. Yes; with that understanding your Institute would be content?—Provided the salaries were brought up to that level. We have not seen the assistants' salaries.

760. I said, in my statement yesterday morning, that the balance remaining over and above the saving in consequence of the modification of the staff was £4,400, and that that was nearly enough to bring all the salaries of all the assistants, male and female, up to the highest now paid anywhere?—There is only one thing. I think the Institute would prefer to see where the assistant comes in raised to 40 or 45, and the extra amount there put on to some of our junior assistants.

761. Is that not rather sacrificing the children to the salaries of the teachers?—That is not the opinion of those who work in this class of schools.

762. I am afraid they are not altogether disinterested?—They ought to be better informed than outsiders.

763. And they want more still?—No doubt they would take more.

764. I do not wish to reflect upon that desire. I only said, were not they rather interested? The point I chiefly want to ask you about is this: Supposing a scale of staffing and salaries were drawn up, based on the evidence given before the Commission, and were adopted by Parliament, and proper powers given by Parliament, on the recommendation of the Commission, to make it permanent, would not that be equivalent to a block vote? If a future scale was so fixed it might come to more than £4 per head; certainly it would if the number of small schools was increased, and that would come to the same as a block vote, would it not?—It is questionable.

765. There is no question about it. It is simply a matter of thinking out clearly. It is quite conceivable that it might come to more than £4 per head, or to less; but if that scale were maintained, irrespective of what the capitation might amount to, is not that the same as a block vote?—What we are afraid of is that when it comes before Parliament next year that allowance might be voted, and if new schools are established in the meantime the salaries must suffer.

766. But if it were fixed?—Will if be fixed for any number of years?

767. It would have the same fixity as a block vote. What you want is to have a satisfactory scale adopted, and the amount voted by Parliament each year that is necessary to provide for payment on that scale?—That is all.

768. Well, if the scale is adopted, and has the permanency that laws generally have in fairly well governed countries, that would be equivalent to a block vote?—I do not think there would be any permanency. We have found, with regard to teachers, that when the colony has been most prosperous they have reduced salaries.

769. You do not understand my question. Can you devise any block vote that is more likely to be permanent, since it must be voted from year to year, than this—because this is a block vote?—We are quite content to get the colonial scale, supposing the salaries to be the same as they are here, so long as we get the amount voted; but we think, if it is put on a *per capita* basis, that it will not be got.

770. *Mr. Stewart.*] Which, in your opinion, would be most desirable—a provincial system, which could be varied at three months' notice, if thought necessary, four times in one year, or a system under which the vote would be made by Parliament annually?—Undoubtedly, I think the annual payment would be better than the three-monthly payment.

771. *The Chairman.*] Has your system been varied once in three months, Mr. Macdonald?—Well, by giving three months' notice the Board could, of course, vary it.

772. Has that ever occurred in Otago?—I think so.

773. At three months' notice?—Three months' notice of change of salaries.

774. Throughout the whole district?—Yes, throughout the whole district.

775. I did not know that was so. You say you believe in a colonial scale?—Yes, providing it satisfies what we have asked.

776. But do I understand from that that you want to see the salaries of teachers made uniform throughout the whole of New Zealand?—Providing they are brought up to a certain level.

777. But, supposing they are brought down to a certain level, are you willing that the hill-tops should be made to meet the valleys half-way?—Decidedly not.

778. Then, you are not prepared to make a sacrifice in this district for the purpose of meeting the underpaid teachers in other districts—you do not want a middle line?—I think they should be brought up to our level, because I do not think any of us overpaid now.

779. Is it not the case that many are underpaid?—It is a disgrace to New Zealand—they are.

780. What class of teachers are underpaid in Otago?—We have already put it in that report. I could not mention it from memory, but I think some head-teachers get £70 a year, which is altogether too small.

781. You have been asked questions about the payment of female teachers and male teachers. You think there ought to be a difference; and I think you mentioned that in the case of females a distinction ought to be drawn because their occupation was not a life's work?—That is so.

782. Is there any condition binding upon the male teacher of the colony making the occupation his life's work when he enters it?—No, excepting that when a man has spent the best years of his life in preparing for the profession he does not readily change it for another, whereas a large number of women get married and retire from the service altogether.

783. Do men leave the service because they get married?—No.

784. Supposing the tables were turned, and the superior salaries were paid to the women, do you think the women would leave the service then?—I think a large number would.

785. Some reference has been made to dressmakers and milliners receiving large wages: are they in the habit of leaving their employment in the same way as teachers?—I could not say. My experience is limited in that respect.

786. In the other respect your experience is not so limited?—Well, of course, I have noticed that a large number of teachers do leave the service, but I could not say anything with regard to other professions.

787. Reversing the position, do you not think that if the men were paid the lower salaries they would leave the service?—Well, the men would not enter the service at all.

788. They would stop at home and nurse the babies?—No; they would go into other professions.

789. What do you think of the salaries paid to headmasters and assistants?—I think the assistants, especially the first assistants, in our schools should certainly get a high salary, because they have often to take the place of the headmaster, are of great assistance to him, and there is long experience gained in working up to a first assistant's position.

790. You think they are not adequately paid?—They get a fair salary, but if the salary could be raised, I think they are deserving of higher pay.

791. Do you think the first assistant's salary ought to be at least half that of the headmaster?—It should be considerably more than that. I should think we are a long way above that in Otago.

792. Do you think the first assistant ought to have any house allowance?—That is a question I have not gone into. But we have never had it in Otago. I have never thought about the subject.

793. I suppose they have to pay rent if they are married men, and if they are single they will have to pay for lodgings?—The married men will have to pay rent, and many of them are married men. Some of our second assistants are married.

794. Regarding the appointment of teachers, do you think the present system of being appointed by Committees satisfactory?—No, I do not. I do not think the Committees have sufficient data to go upon, nor in many cases are they competent to appoint our teachers.

795. Do you think there would be much complaint on the part of the Committees if the Otago Board was to assert itself, and insist upon its own appointments unless good ground could be shown?—I dare say there might be some dissatisfaction. I would not like to express an opinion. The Committees elect the members of the Education Board, and I suppose in that way they would be responsible. Certainly the Education Board should have more say in the appointments. They have the Inspectors there, and I do not know that anybody can tell the quality of the work except the Inspectors, who are experts and who see all the work.

796. Do not you think it a terrible injustice—an injustice greater than the salaries—that the teachers in a large province like this should be, when seeking an appointment, virtually in the hands of a few men chosen to represent the householders, instead of the power being exercised by a competent and responsible body?—Well, I can give you my own personal opinion.

797. That is what I want?—My own opinion personally is that when an appointment has to be made there should be some regular system of promotion in the Board, and that promotion should be made on the recommendation of the Inspectors, or of what the Inspectors say of the work. When an appointment has to be made a Committee should be asked whether there are any special circumstances surrounding the appointment that they would like the teacher to satisfy. For instance, there might be different requirements in agricultural or industrial districts, town or country. These representations should be sent to the Board, and then the appointments should be made on the recommendation of the Inspector from the applicants for the position.

798. When you refer to the Committee, do you refer to the local School Committee?—I do. I think they should send in any local circumstances which they think require consideration; but I would not have them make the appointments.

799. You would like to see the teacher placed in this position: that it should not be necessary for him, in order to better his position, that he should go round to the members of the School Committee?—Yes; that is very objectionable.

800. Is not that one of the crying evils of the present system?—There is no doubt it is. I should like to explain before I go that you might think we are very much opposed to this last scheme put in by Mr. Hogben; but we feel, and have felt ever since we met Mr. Hogben—the Council met Mr. Hogben in Wellington—that he is trying to do the best he can for us. The first scheme was tentative, and, with regard to the second scheme, he has drawn it out to satisfy our requirements. We are very thankful for what Mr. Hogben has done, and I think the Institute appreciates what he has done for us.

Miss J. Hooper examined.

Miss Hooper: I represent the infant mistresses, and on their behalf, as well as my own, protest against any reduction in our salaries. I may point out that, although £5 or £10, or even £15, may seem very little to a millionaire, that amount off a small salary of £85, £110, or even £120, means a great deal. Say a girl on going to her first school is paid £85: she cannot have saved anything of her salary as pupil-teacher, and if she is away from home she has to pay board and lodging, and keep herself in clothes. Thus a good part of her salary is used up. If she wants to keep up her studies she must have books; and if she wants to pay a periodical visit to her home from, say, such a place as Kurow, Naseby, or Cromwell her travelling-expenses are very heavy—so heavy, indeed, that perhaps only one visit a year is within her means. As for luxuries or extras, where are they to come from? Again, if she is within reach of a large centre she might wish to attend classes. Thus another demand is made upon that very slender purse. Now that the Board propose to have Saturday classes for instruction in hand-

work, such teachers will naturally wish to attend. Travelling and incidental expenses come in here. If it cannot well be done on £85, how can it be done on £80? The importance of the work in an infant department is very great, and is rendered extremely arduous sometimes from the small amount of help available from the staff. The fact that she has to organize six or more classes, in much the same way as a headmaster does for the rest of the school, raises her in importance above the other assistants, and she has the teaching of the sewing and the training of the pupil-teachers in the art of teaching. A point to be noticed here is that when the mistress gets her new pupil-teachers they know nothing of teaching, and take some time to get into fair working-order. Then they are perhaps moved off to learn another branch of school-work. The mistress then takes charge of another novice, and the work of training begins over again. I point this out to show the strain on the mistress. In this important branch of the service we are offered by way of encouragement in the proposed scale a large decrease in salary. Naturally we look for promotion; but how is it to be brought about? We get into a fairly good position and there we remain, always hoping that some vacancy will occur higher up, and that we might get a chance to fill it. Instead of suffering a decrease on what I might term a sliding-scale, we should like to see something added by way of increment for efficiency and length of service. But, as all things come to those who know how to wait, I trust our turn is close at hand. Perhaps the new alternative scale holds a solution of the problem. We should like to see adequate remuneration for our women teachers. Women in other districts have opportunities of gaining much higher salaries on account of the different methods of dividing the school; but, as that does not obtain here, we have no chance of rising to anything higher than £180, which, after taking everything into account, is little enough for a maximum and is not adequate remuneration when we think of the salaries that are paid to dressmakers and milliners.

801. *Mr Mackenzie.*] I suppose you see that the second scale does not reduce the rates?—I based my calculations on the other scale.

802. If the new scale is adopted it will largely meet your objections?—This does not come up to our highest schools. It stops about midway.

803. Do you consider that just now you are not sufficiently paid?—Yes.

804. What percentage more do you think you should have—perhaps 10 or 15 per cent. more than you are now paid?——

805. *The Chairman.*] Just as much as you can get?—Yes.

806. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You referred to the salaries paid to milliners and dressmakers?—I can tell you the salaries that are paid. Dressmakers in head positions get: In Dunedin, from £3 10s. to even £7; in Christchurch, from £4 to £8; in Wellington, from £4 to £7; and Oamaru, £3 to £4 10s. Saleswomen and milliners receive in Dunedin £2 10s. to £4; £5 is exceptional; and saleswomen, £2 to £2 5s. in show-rooms.

807. Of course, you reasonably expect that teachers are entitled to higher pay than milliners and saleswomen?—Certainly.

808. You perhaps noticed the Chairman thought that if women teachers were paid as highly as the men they might take husbands to keep as luxuries?——

The Chairman: I did not say "as luxuries."

809. Do you think there would be a chance of such a thing taking place?—Well, you have not provided for it in the scale.

810. But if provided what would occur?—It might cause a revolution.

811. *Mr. Davidson.*] In your statement you dealt entirely with the first suggested scale?—Yes.

812. Did you notice that in schools of 250 the term "infant mistress" had been taken from the first female teacher in that school? The first female teacher is not to have the title of "infant mistress:" do you object to their losing their status by the taking-away of that title?—I think if they teach the infant department they should certainly have their title.

813. Then, in the second scale their title has been restored to them: do you approve of that?—Yes.

814. In the first scale the mistress in the first grade of school was reduced £5; that you disapprove of strongly?—Yes.

815. Do you notice that in scale No. 2, instead of being reduced £5, the salary has been raised £5, so that instead of receiving as now £85 they will receive £90: you approve of that addition?—Yes. I think that it should start at £95.

816. Still the improvement is marked?—Yes.

817. In schools having an attendance of 65, instead of £85 they will receive £100?—Yes.

818. That is a considerable rise?—Yes.

819. In schools from 90 to 120 you will have noticed the salary is increased?—Yes.

820. What is your present position under the Board?—Infant mistress in the Kensington School.

821. What is the average attendance?—Last quarter it was 298.

822. What is your present salary?—£120.

823. Under the first suggested scale you would have been reduced to?—£105.

824. Under the second scale, instead of a reduction of £15, you would receive an increase of £10?—Yes.

825. In your opinion, that is a much more satisfactory scale?—Certainly.

826. I wanted to bring out as strongly as I could, Miss Hooper, that the class of teachers who, in your opinion, were being unfairly treated, according to scheme No. 1, are being very much more liberally treated by scheme No. 2. Instead of suffering decreases of salary they now receive fairly large increases?—Might I ask a question? What would be the maximum in a school, say, of 690 to 725?

827. What is the maximum paid to any mistress in Otago at the present time?—£160.
828. Is it not £155?—Yes; it was £160, but is now £155.
829. Under No. 1 scale, what would be the maximum paid in Otago?—£180.
830. So that would mean an increase of £25 a year?—Yes.
831. Under the new scale it seems that the infant mistresses in all the schools in Otago will receive substantial increases. In your opinion, scale No. 2 satisfies the class of teachers you represent?—I did not say that. I was thinking of it in proportion to the salaries paid to first assistants. I think the infant mistresses' work is quite as important and perhaps as arduous as the first assistants', and I was thinking whether the difference between our salaries and theirs was a fair arrangement.
832. This suggested scale goes in the direction of greatly reducing the disparity—that is, in the right direction?—Yes.
833. Do you think the infant mistress occupies the same position of responsibility in a school as the first male assistant?—She has much responsibility in a different way. Her responsibility is great.
834. Supposing in an emergency the headmaster had to leave his duties, who would assume the responsibility of being the head of the school—the infant mistress or the first male teacher?—I suppose, the first male teacher.
835. As far as responsibility for the management of the school in an emergency is to be regarded, the first male assistant occupies the more responsible position?—That would be only at times.
836. You think that in scale No. 2 an attempt has been made to remove the objections of the class of teachers you represent?—Yes.
837. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] If you compare the proposed scale No. 2 with the staff at present in your school you find you would be entitled to another assistant. Is the work too heavy for the present staff in the Kensington School?—Yes, it is.
838. How many pupils are in your division?—128.
839. And what assistance?—One pupil-teacher all the time, and one half the time.
840. You could do with more than that, surely?—Yes, I could.
841. You will find that, according to scale No. 2, the Kensington School will be entitled to another assistant. Have you any experience of small country schools?—I taught in a country school where there was a headmaster, a mistress, and one pupil-teacher.
842. You have not had charge of a small country school yourself?—No.
843. Would you give us your opinion in regard to the number of pupils that could be taught efficiently in a small country school where the female was sole teacher?—I do not think I could very well, because I have not had any experience in that department of work.
844. Do you consider the disparity between the salaries of male and female teachers should be minimised as far as possible—that is, that they should have equal pay for equal work, or that we should reduce the difference between the salaries of male and female teachers as much as we possibly can?—Yes.
845. *Mr. Hill.*] Which would you rather take, if it were in your power to select—a country school with an average attendance of 20, or the position you now occupy, the salary being the same?—I would sooner stay where I am.
846. Notwithstanding the great responsibility you have?—Yes.
847. And you think you have a good deal of responsibility?—Yes.
848. Do you think that a teacher, say, in the same school with a class of 40 pupils has equal responsibility?—Well, the arrangement of the class-work would be different.
849. But in the matter of responsibility?—What do you mean when you speak of responsibility? Perhaps we do not agree.
The Chairman: I think that is rather a delicate question. Miss Hooper does not wish to exaggerate the importance of her work.
850. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you not think that on the proper choice of persons for the position of infant mistress depends the subsequent success of the education of the child?—Yes, very much.
851. You have made some study of infant-school methods, I believe?—I have.
852. Do you think the infant department one of the most important, perhaps the most important part of a school? I am asking these questions because I feel very strongly that we have yet to recognise in New Zealand the full importance of the infant schoolroom, and that when we do that we shall considerably lighten the work of the upper classes. Do you not think that for the more recent methods in infant-school instruction a larger staffing is required than has hitherto been the rule in New Zealand schools?—Yes.
853. By that I mean the kindergarten and handwork methods require larger staffing?—Certainly they do.
854. And is it your belief that the kindergarten, or handwork, and other kinds are more effective means of instruction for the children they reach than the standard ones?—Yes, it is.
855. And, therefore, that it is desirable to strengthen the infant-school staffing as much as we can afford to do it?—Yes.

MONDAY, 20TH MAY, 1901.

ELIZABETH WILKINSON examined.

Miss Wilkinson: I represent the female assistants of the various schools of Otago. I ask your indulgence while I address you briefly. The proposed scale specifies that in the staffing of schools there shall be male and female teachers in alternate positions. In the case of large schools this means that a female teacher as second assistant will be expected to take a Fifth Standard and

do Fifth Standard work. This the female teachers, on the whole, have no desire to do. They deem themselves physically unfit to cope, year after year, with the discipline of such a class. They are satisfied that in schools where, say, six adult teachers are employed the first and second assistants should be males, and that in schools where there are seven or eight adult teachers the first three positions should be held by males. Now, while under this arrangement it falls to the female teachers to take the work of the lower standards, yet the responsibility is not lessened one iota. They fully realise the fact that if the chain is to be a complete and perfect one, then every link must form an important part, and have its own place and value. So with each standard: each has its relative importance, and each bears on the working of the other. So if our responsibility is relatively as great our status should not be lowered. Recognising, then, the importance of our work, it is only right and fitting that a just remuneration for the same should be granted us. In fixing a minimum, certain facts must be taken into consideration—viz. (1) Period of apprenticeship; (2) additional period of training in the college; (3) responsibility attached to our work; (4) rate of promotion; (5) the dignity incumbent on our profession. Under the proposed scheme £80 is the fixed minimum for female assistants. Now, gentlemen, note particularly this fact: that £80 is the fixed minimum for female assistants. This amount is insufficient under any circumstances, but is especially so as the rate of promotion is so very slow, and teachers filling these positions are compelled to remain in them for an indefinite period—ten or twelve years—through no fault of their own, but simply from the fact that there are not other and better positions for them to fill. Vacancies are few and far between, and so it is that our experience, service, and efficiency go for nothing, inasmuch as they receive no tangible reward. It is true that after several years of hard, conscientious, and very wearing work we do receive a number to our letter, but that does not by any means pay for all our wants. We would go further: Surely experience and efficiency should count for something and should be duly recognised. Many holding these positions are teachers who have given efficient service in the country, and who came to town in good faith, thinking they were receiving promotion; but, alas! after a year or two they suffered reduction, under our Otago scale, from £115 to £95, and who will, under the proposed scale, suffer a reduction from £95 to £80. I shall let the figures speak for themselves. Then, there is the dignity incumbent on our position. As it is, we have the dignity *minus* the means to support that dignity, for what can be done with £80 a year after deducting board and lodging? Not much. It is a bare living-wage, and surely our service is worthy of more. In bringing our case before your notice I thought of comparing our profession with others, but we occupy such a unique position that a comparison is impossible. We stand alone, for with us rests not only the responsibility of giving an education in the mere rudiments, but the responsibility of inculcating and of instilling into the minds of the young those morals and principles which go towards making good men and good women, on whom depends the future welfare of this colony. I would here quote to you Newbolt's lines:—

Beyond his books his teaching sped;
He left on whom he taught the trace
Of kinship with the deathless dead,
And faith in all the Island race.

As our system is a national one, it is but proper that the Government, when it has the means, should fittingly remunerate those who play such an important part in the progress of the colony. Here I would like to sound a note of warning. If you do not hold out sufficient inducements you cannot expect to attract the best, and so in course of time you will find you have a second-rate type filling the ranks of the teaching profession, and naturally, I should say, a correspondingly second-rate type of education—a thing to be deplored. Now, with these facts before you, gentlemen, I would, on behalf of the assistant female teachers, recommend that £100 be the fixed minimum salary for any certificated female teacher, whether she be in a school of 19 or over. I would also recommend that no two teachers in one school should receive the same payment, but that the gradation of salaries should be by fair increments, so that efficiency and length of service be duly recognised, especially as the highest positions in the ranks of female teachers are so seldom vacant, and therefore practically unattainable by the majority. It is argued that in allotting salaries to males and females the obligations falling on males demand that they should be paid considerably in advance of the female. Are there no obligations devolving on females? If the truth were known, in the majority of cases the obligations are quite as great, if not greater. Not that we would advocate equal pay for equal work, for in a society constituted such as ours is we have the common-sense to recognise that this would be detrimental to our interests. All we wish is an adequate remuneration for the work done, which is of no mean order.

856. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I gather that the provisions of the subsequent scale admitted by Mr. Hogben will meet your views?—No.

857. It reduces the disparity between the existing salaries and those that some bodies would like?—It does not meet with our views at all.

858. You think the scale does not go as far as it ought to go?—I do not.

859. Although it improves the position at present existing?—There is nothing in the new scheme to show that the position of assistants will be improved, although the mistresses' position will be improved.

860. *Mr. Davidson.*] What experience have you had in teaching?—I was for four years a pupil-teacher in the Kaikorai Public School. I was for fifteen months in a subsidised school at Galloway at a salary of £40. There were fourteen pupils, and all the standards were taught. Then I was for two years and a half in a country school at a salary of £70, and for the last four years I have been junior assistant in the Forbury School at a salary of £85.

861. Will you kindly give the Commission, as briefly as you can, your experience in a subsidised school?—I went seven miles out of Alexandra to the Galloway School, on a station. I had 14 children to teach. I lived in the homestead and received £40 a year, and in addition to my teaching

I had to teach 4 children music. The travelling-expenses to Alexandra were considerable. I was there fifteen months.

862. You had 14 of an average attendance?—Yes.

863. What amount was contributed by the Board towards your salary?—All I received was £40, which I received through the hands of the station-manager.

864. You were practically a governess in the family of the station-manager?—I would not own to that position. I said, "I am not a governess, but a Government teacher."

865. Were you appointed by the Board?—Yes; and I had a definite statement from the secretary of the Board showing that I was taking up the position, and that I was to receive board and lodging and receive £40 a year. My school was examined like other schools, and I had a "surprise" visit from the Inspector. I was really a public-school teacher.

866. Was the Board aware that you were doing the duties of a governess in teaching music to the family?—I presume so.

867. Do you know the amount of salary the station-manager received from the Board?—No.

868. How many years ago is it since you were in that position?—Nearly eight years ago.

869. Have you examined No. 1 scale particularly?—Yes, I have.

870. You have had some experience in small schools: how many pupils in average attendance do you think a sole teacher is capable of managing?—I have only had experience in a school where there were 24 children, and I can only speak of that.

871. Do you think you could manage an attendance of 40 in a small school?—I dare say I could, but I would find the work hard.

872. Do you think that the allowance of an assistant teacher on the staff is a sufficiently liberal staffing allowance?—I do not think an assistant is necessary.

873. What form of assistance would be best in a school of the kind?—An assistant.

874. Do you think a school could be managed efficiently by a lady with an average attendance of 45?—Up to that, but not beyond it.

875. You think the assistance should come in as nearly as possible after 40?—Yes.

876. And that it should take the form of a certificated mistress?—Yes.

877. Do you remember the salary attached to the position of mistress?—I think it is £85.

878. Under the first scale the suggested salary is £80: I understand you think that reduction is not justified?—No, not at all.

879. Under scale No. 2, instead of a reduction of £5, there is an increase of £5?—That is certainly better, but it is not sufficient.

880. Have you compared the suggested scale of £90 with that at present paid in other departments in New Zealand?—No. I know only of the Otago District.

881. You would not be surprised to learn that the suggested £90 is a great increase in most districts besides being an increase in Otago?—No.

882. The next group is 65 to 90: do you know what salary is paid to the mistress in that school?—£100; but I must say I have not gone into the position of mistresses at all. I have confined myself to the case of the assistants.

883. Do you notice that a mistress would be admitted into a school, under this scale, when the average attendance reached 40?—Yes.

884. Under the Otago scale such a position does not become vacant until the average attendance is 50?—That is so.

885. The large number of schools between 40 and 50 in the colony would therefore create vacancies for female teachers which now do not exist, so that many of the women in the city schools who are straining to maintain discipline and receiving only £80 would have the opportunity of getting positions at £90?—Yes, I notice that.

886. *Mr. Stewart.*] You have looked at this matter purely from the standpoint of the schools of Otago?—Yes.

887. Are you aware that the salaries now proposed in the alternative scale would materially increase the majority of lady teachers in the colony? Have you ever had any information with regard to that matter before you?—No; but I should say if they have not been paid as Otago has been paid it is "more shame" to the other districts.

888. Does not that emphasize the necessity of a colonial scale?—Yes.

889. Are you in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.

890. *Mr. Hill.*] Did I understand you to say the lady assistants do the same kind of work as the male assistants?—I say the responsibility is relatively as great, because they have to deal with the children according to the capacity of those children.

891. What number have you to teach?—76.

892. Do you teach them alone?—I do.

893. Is it possible to supervise such a number efficiently?—I think I can manage a class of 76.

894. And supervise the work efficiently?—Yes.

895. Do you mark all the copybooks, exercises, and drawing-books?—Yes.

896. What is your salary?—I am receiving £85 from the Education Board.

897. For teaching 76 children?—Yes.

898. How long have you been teaching?—About twelve or thirteen years.

899. Now, as to what you have said about the pay, if you had exactly the same work as a man, would you accept half the pay a man would receive?—I do not make any distinction. All we want is adequate remuneration.

900. For doing the same work as a man, do you think you should charge a lower price for that work?—I do not like to commit myself there.

901. I do not see why you should not?—I say that, as a matter of principle, I would not like to accept the wage of a man. I would be sorry to see a man doing the work I do for £85 a year.

902. And do you not see that the claim you are setting forth will ruin the cause of the man you are trying to support?—I do not think so.

903. You do not think the claim set up by women, to have a lower rate for the same work, would tend to lower the wages of men eventually?—I do not think so, if you give adequate remuneration to the women.

904. *Mr. Smith.*] What standard do you teach?—The Second Standard, with 76 children.

905. How many hours are the children in school?—From half-past 9 till half-past 3, with an interval of one hour for lunch.

906. Can you overlook the exercise-books, the copy-books, the drawing-books, and the dictation-books in school-hours, or do you do it after school-hours?—In the Second Standard we do not have dictation. I supervise the other books, doing most of the work in school-hours.

907. You have to devote some time outside of school-hours to the work?—Not very often.

908. *The Chairman.*] You think there should be a uniform rate of pay throughout the colony?—Yes, I think it would be an advantage.

909. Suppose that in Auckland the rate of pay is less than in Otago, you do not wish all your Otago girls reduced to the scale of the Auckland?—Certainly not.

910. You say the rate of pay for female teachers is generally inadequate?—I think so.

911. As they are situated now, they remain for many years in the same position without any promotion or increase of pay?—Yes, that is so.

912. Do you know whether those teachers in the town schools who remain for as much as twelve years in the one position ever apply for positions in the country schools?—So many of them have already given their services in the country that they are unwilling to go again to the country, seeing their homes are in the town, unless they get sufficient inducement.

913. They will not go into the country because the inducement is not sufficient?—That is one of the reasons.

914. Supposing there was equal pay for both male and female teachers, whom do you think it would hurt?—I think that as society is constituted the females would be the losers in the long-run, because we would have to compete with men, and in doing so we would lose our positions in the world as women.

915. You think that women would be satisfied with less pay?—Yes, as long as the remuneration is adequate.

916. But you do not want a great difference?—I do not think it should be very great.

917. Is it too great at the present time?—I do not think I have sufficiently considered that point to give an answer for those I am representing. I can state, as an example, my own case: I receive £85 for teaching 76 children. The first assistant has about half the number, and receives about three times as much as I do. Surely the work or responsibility is not three times as great. I therefore think the gulf there is rather wide. I do not grudge the gentlemen their pay, but I want ours to be brought up higher.

918. In the address you gave you stated that the lady teachers for whom you appear consider the salaries in the schools should be different?—Yes.

919. No two salaries should be equal?—That is so.

920. To whom should the smaller salaries go, and to whom should the larger salaries go?—I cannot answer that very well.

921. You are dividing the school into halves—the lower standards to the females and the higher standards to the males?—I was thinking of the female teachers when I said that. Supposing the male teacher is getting £140 for teaching the Fourth Standard, I think that £130 is a proper salary for the lady who teaches the Third Standard.

922. You think the salary of the females should be lower than those of the males?—I think we would be satisfied with less. It is my own opinion I am giving, and I do not bind any one else to it. We did not discuss that question at all.

CHARLES YOUNG examined.

Mr. Young: I have been deputed by the Educational Institute of Otago to speak respecting the staffing of schools. I refer wholly to mixed schools. I, though agreeing on the whole with the staffs of the schools, as given in the proposed scale, so far as adult teachers are concerned, think, however, that the arrangements might be amended in a few particulars. In schools with two adults the head-teacher should be a male, and the other teacher a female—the infant mistress. In schools with four adult teachers (250 pupils and over) the first assistant should be a male. One great weakness of the scheme, as outlined, is the alternation of male and female assistants, which allows the first or the second assistant to be a female. A female holding the first position in schools of this size would be required to teach a large class of pupils in Standard IV., Standard V., or Standard VI., or it might be any two combined. Though we know that in a few cases this work has been, and is now, successfully done by a female, the strain is too great physically and mentally. The boys of such a class are not generally amenable to female jurisdiction, and require to be under the charge of a master. Therefore, in schools of four teachers the first assistant should be a male. Moreover, in large schools of six adult teachers (over 330 pupils) the second assistant is required to teach a large class in one of the upper standards, and for the same reason this position should be held by a male. In a school of 500 and upwards such a teacher requires to be a man of proved ability in his profession, capable of commanding a large class, and of such length of service as entitles him to be classed in the second division. In Otago this position is universally held by men of from sixteen to eighteen years' service—men who are certainly entitled to a remuneration of more than £110 a year—the wages of unskilled labour in any other department of production. Such a man is nearly always drawn from the ranks of the country teachers, and is in all probability a married man, who should obtain

at least salary sufficient to keep up his position as belonging to an important profession. In the case of a school employing eight adult teachers (over 500 pupils) the classes are of such size as to necessitate an adult teacher to each standard. As the time of the headmaster is fully occupied in the management and supervision of the school, Standards V. and VI. are under the first and second male assistants respectively; and, as the managing of a Standard IV. class of 60 to 80 pupils is too great for the capabilities of an average female assistant, this class requires to be placed under a male assistant. Therefore, in such schools the first, second, and third assistants should be males. Such an arrangement would place all the upper classes under the charge of males, while the teaching of the lower classes would be reserved for females, who are better qualified for this class of work. The scheme of staffing might easily be arranged that the female teacher would lose neither in status nor salary by this. According to the proposed scale, the first male assistant in schools with a staff of eight adult teachers may be a man of only five years' service, as shown by his requiring only a D3 certificate. This ranks his ability as a teacher below that of the master of a school of 35 pupils, or a good pupil-teacher on finishing his apprenticeship and training-college course. It gives a very false idea of the requirements for such a position. Such a man should have had at least fifteen or sixteen years' experience, and his classification should not be below Division 2. The first male assistant should be a man of recognised ability as a teacher, a good disciplinarian, of sufficient literary attainments as to enable him to teach Class X. and the pupil-teachers, and able to take up the duties of the headmaster in the latter's absence whenever required. How can we expect to find all these qualifications in a teacher classified only D3?

923. *Mr. Davidson.*] You think that in schools in which Standards IV., V., and VI. are fairly large these classes should be staffed by male assistants?—Yes.

924. You would allot the work of the school in this way: the infants and Standards I., II., and III. to females, and the upper part to males?—Yes.

925. Do you know if that is the practice now throughout New Zealand?—I could not say for certain.

926. If you were too look through the large schools of the colony, and you found such was not the case, do you think it would be wise in a colonial scale to make a hard-and-fast rule that that must be so?—I think that to make a hard-and-fast rule in any case is not wise.

927. If it were left to the discretion of the Boards to appoint either male or female teachers on the staff of assistants under certain conditions, it would be better than making a hard-and-fast rule?—Yes, if it were left to the Education Boards, the Inspectors, and the headmaster of the school.

928. That is to say, a Board would not appoint a female assistant to a position such as you indicated should be held by a male except with the approval of the Inspector?—And the headmaster.

929. Suppose such a regulation as this were in force: "Among the assistant teachers (not including the infant mistress) appointed on the staff of a school there shall not be more males than females": would that fulfil the condition you contend for?—No, I do not think it would always.

930. Not if the Board had the right to say, with the approval of the Inspector, whether these males or females should be placed on the staff?—I do not think it should be left wholly to the Board or the Inspector. I think the headmaster should say.

931. The headmaster, you think, should have the sole right to say whether males or females should be appointed as first, second, or third assistants?—I think it should not be a hard-and-fast rule in any case, but nothing should be done without the approval of the headmaster, who is responsible for the work of the school.

932. You think, at any rate, the headmaster should be consulted, and the Inspector's approval obtained, before any arrangement of the staff is fixed?—Yes.

933. You notice that such a condition as I mentioned would enable the class of school from 420 up to have at least three male assistants?—I think there would be more than three. I should like, however, to look over the numbers.

934. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think, Mr. Young, it is a wise thing to hamper the headmaster in the administraion of his school, as to where he should place his assistants?—I think he should put them where they would do the most efficient work.

935. Do you think the Inspectors or the members of the Board are as capable of saying where a member of the staff should go?—No. The headmaster should say.

936. *Mr Luke.*] You are in favour of a colonial scale of salaries and staffs?—Yes.

937. Do you not think it could be definitely settled whether a colonial scale is equitable without referring to the Board or the headmaster?—Yes, I think it could.

938. Which do you consider is the most important standard to teach in a school?—I should say the Sixth.

939. You would not say it was the Fourth?—No.

940. *Mr. Hill.*] You think the proposed colonial scale (No. 1) of staffing is more generous than the Otago scale?—Yes.

941. Suppose some modification were allowed in the matter of choice as to whether an assistant master or an assistant mistress, or, say, a junior master, instead of two pupil-teachers should be employed, do you think that would get over the objection you have raised as to the staffing of the schools?—Yes, I think it would.

942. Do you think that women in schools can do as much work as men?—In a particular way they can.

943. I suppose you are aware that in New Zealand there are schools where the females are separated from the males for instruction?—Yes.

944. You said you thought the women could not teach as efficiently as the men in the higher standards: I suppose you are aware they do so in Christchurch?—Not in mixed schools.

945. No; but in a separate department they do the work?—I could not say how the larger schools there are staffed.

946. In Christchurch the standards are divided into sexes, and a lady is the teacher of the girls and a man of the boys?—Yes.

947. Do you not think, then, that the headmaster would have the right to place the lady in charge of the boys?—I think it would be wrong, as the strain would be too great.

948. But would the teacher have the right to place the lady there?—I think he has the right to put the staff where he thinks it is proper they should be placed, but he should not give his lady teachers work they cannot cope with.

949. You recognise that in a large school the teachers are really class-teachers?—I think they are more than that. They are the teachers of particular classes according to their ability.

950. You think, however, the master has the right to remove them according to their ability?—Yes; but he would place them where their services would be most efficient, and in that case the first assistant should have the more difficult work.

951. Does it follow that because he is the first assistant he is the most capable to take Standard VI.?—Yes, he is the most capable to take the most difficult work.

952. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to proposed scale No. 2, do you think the scheme of staffing is sufficient to insure the effective teaching of schools?—I do not know. It only shows up to 330.

953. You have not heard the teachers of Otago complain of overwork, or that the schools were understaffed?—Yes; but I say that a good man could manage to overtake the work.

954. You admit there may be individual cases in which the assistants of schools, on account of very large classes, may have a little too much to do?—They may. I have never found it so, and I have taught every standard.

955. You admit there may be exceptions? In the one year the Sixth Standard may be exceptionally large, and in the following year the Fifth may be?—I have never found a standard I had difficulty in managing.

956. Have you had experience as a teacher in a country school?—Yes; I was for four years and a half sole teacher in a school with an average attendance of from 40 to 46. I was for two years relieving in schools up to 200.

957. How many pupils can a sole teacher efficiently teach in a country school in which all the standards are represented?—I taught from 40 to 46 in a school, and I found no difficulty.

958. With the increased freedom of classification and grouping, do you not consider that a teacher in a country school can teach up to 45 without assistance?—A male teacher can.

959. And what form should the assistance take thereafter—a pupil-teacher or an assistant?—An assistant.

960. How many can a teacher and a female assistant efficiently teach—in other words, when should the pupil-teacher come?—Between 90 and 100.

961. Is it a fact, in the Otago District, that assistant teachers are not allowed to get sufficient marks from the Inspectors to rank in Grade 1?—Within late years I understand that is so. Unless a teacher has shown organizing power and ability to manage a school he will not receive sufficient marks to rank in Grade 1.

962. Is that fair to this district, seeing that in other districts they are given the marks?—If they are given the marks in other districts it is wrong.

963. Consequently, if the Inspectors were under the central department, and uniformity prevailed, such an anomaly would not exist?—It is to be hoped it would not.

964. *Mr. Weston.*] How many years' experience as a teacher have you had?—Twenty-one, in addition to my training.

965. You have worked with Mr. White, have you not?—Yes, for four years.

966. *The Chairman.*] You said you consider the Inspectors and Boards, in conjunction with the master, should have a free hand with regard to the arrangement of teachers, male and female?—Yes.

967. The object should be to secure a strong staff?—Yes.

968. Would you be in favour of apportioning certain standards to males to the exclusion of females?—There might be exceptional cases.

969. In exceptional cases you prefer to see a strong teacher selected for the difficult work?—Yes.

ANGUS MARSHALL examined.

Mr. Marshall: I have been deputed, not only on behalf of the Institute but on behalf of the assistants, to say a few words. It has been allotted to me to speak on the minimum salary. In the introduction to the proposed scale it is set forth that one of the objects of the scale is to induce men to enter the profession, or, at least, to remain in it after they have entered it. Therefore, to begin with male pupil-teachers, such salaries should be offered that youths may be induced to enter, and, when you have got them into the service, that they will remain in it. And how will you induce them? The present salary is £30, and you cannot get them. In Otago, for every male that applies twenty females apply. Let us take the school in Dunedin that supplies many of the pupil-teachers, and go back about six years: I find that from this school twenty-three pupil-teachers were appointed, and of the twenty-three two were males. Yet in the same time, from the same school—the Normal—fifty-eight have gone through the Civil Service Examination, and those who have received appointments have been in the ratio of thirteen males to two females. I say, then, that £20 will not induce male pupil-teachers to enter the service. Then, in raising, under proposed scale, the female pupil-teachers' salaries, something like £1,000 will be expended annually when there is no need for it, seeing that twenty-three females apply for every male who offers. I also wish to say something about a living-wage for teachers. In this scale providing for pupil-teachers you will have females applying for, and practically appointed to, all the positions, and in

the recommendations either of our own body or in the proposed scale you will have adult females in equal numbers to males; so that in every school, taking this scale as a basis, you will have three females to every male. Approximately, three-fourths of the staff will be females. The male teachers are supposed to take the more arduous work. The usual course is to put the males on to the more difficult standards—the higher classes where these are mixed. In Otago at present it is usual to grade the female in the third place, or perhaps the second place, but fourth assistant males are given the more difficult classes. It was stated this morning before the Commission that a lady was teaching a class of 70 or 80 children for £80 a year, and in the proposed scale a man is offered £1 10s. 9¼d. a week to teach a large class. Window-cleaners and lamp-lighters get more than that, and the assistants I represent have asked me to point out that the artisans and labourers, even those of the lowest class, get more wages than is offered them under the proposed scale. Turning over the book of awards in the Supreme Court, Dunedin, we find that the lowest wage paid to pastrycooks and bakers is £2 5s.; to tailors, £2 10s.; to flour-millers, £2, and in Canterbury up to £2 14s.; to boot-makers, £2, and if the bootmaker has a boy under his charge he must receive £2 10s.; to carpenters, 1s. 3d. an hour, or £2 15s. per week; and workers in the furniture trade, 8s. a day. Now, what is the assistant's work? It has been said that when a class has 70 or 80 pupils in it the teacher should have an assistant or a pupil-teacher, and we were told on Saturday the pupil-teacher would do the mechanical work. Now, those of us who are teachers know very well that in a large class no one can do the mechanical work but the teacher himself. If he gives the class an exercise he must see how it has been done. He must see the weak points himself. If some one else goes through the work, and then the teacher goes through the same, the work is simply duplicated. That is not all. The pupil-teacher who comes into this class to assist the teacher is not to be a beginner. Suppose this pupil-teacher to have had two years' service in some other class, the pupil-teacher will then be drawing £40, and £12 lodging-money—say, £52 a year—for mechanical work, and the teacher is paid only £80 to do the teaching. It is not only the work the teacher has to do: on this £80 a year the teacher is supposed to fit himself for higher work. You will pardon me, gentlemen, if I still bring up Otago, but I do not think you quite realise the work the men have to do in Otago. They have to do something besides class-teaching. In Otago, besides class-work, the teachers have to take up many other things. The teacher is a class-teacher, I understand, if he teaches a class, and more than a class-teacher if he one day takes several combined classes in gymnastics, next day part of the time for drill, next day to swimming, next day to shooting, next to dancing, and in some schools even to the Bible class. I have now to inform you that the assistants, forty-three in number, have resolved that we state that £110 should be the minimum salary for any man engaged in teaching. The Institute adopted this, but the assistants were inclined to ask a little more than that as a minimum. However, I have stated the lowest sum. Assistants, as I have already said, are asking for what may be considered the wage of any ordinary skilled or even unskilled labourer. You may think the minimum high. Well, let me tell you that in the school where I am placed is a married man with sixteen years' service who gets, under the proposed scale, £80 a year, or £1 10s. 9¼d. a week. I think also that the assistants should be graded separately. There is certain work to be done in a school. You will always find there is some portion of the work more difficult than another. Difficulties are always found in the work; but I venture to say that the assistants who come after the first are not called on in any other province to do the same quality of work that they are in Otago. I might make more of this point, but to prove my assertion I will take an ordinary primary school in this city, and read to you the following table of results of work done by me as a male assistant below rank of first:—University Matriculation Examination—December, 1895, six passed; December, 1896, six passed; December, 1897, six passed; December, 1898, four (all presented) passed; December, 1899, eight passed; December, 1900, three passed, one failed. Civil Service Examination—January, 1896, eight passed; January, 1897, eight passed; January, 1898, fourteen passed; January, 1899, eleven passed, two failed; January, 1900, eight passed, one failed; January, 1901, seven passed, none failed. Teachers' Training-college—February, 1896, one admitted; February, 1897, one admitted; February, 1898, four admitted; February–March, 1899, three admitted; February–March, 1900, one admitted; February–March, 1901, two admitted. Test Examination (qualifying for pupil-teacherships)—December, 1895, no examination was held, but six were appointed from class; December, 1896, eighteen sat for examination, but result not made public; five were appointed from class; December, 1897, twenty-one qualified; December, 1898, sixteen qualified; December, 1899, fourteen qualified; December, 1901, nine qualified. Senior Scholarship Examination—December, 1896, one gained Board scholarship, three gained high-school scholarships; December, 1897, one gained Board scholarship, three high-school scholarships; December, 1899, two gained high-school scholarships; December, 1900, one gained high-school scholarship. This is the work the assistants have been called on to do, and the minimum salary for teachers of that class should be more than the £110 a year offered under proposed scale. The assistants went to some trouble to set out the salary according to the importance and responsibility of the work, and the minimum salary of £110 proposed by the Institute was fixed by men who were above that position, and above consideration personally, and who knew the work. The salary of the second assistant nobody in the position itself cared about stating, but it was carefully considered, and this agreed to: No matter what salary the first assistant may get, the second assistant should receive within £40 less, and the third male should receive within £30 less than the second. That is considered the financial difference in the importance of their work, and in this connection I think you will admit the assistants are the best qualified to offer an opinion. I should like to speak on the question of town and country teachers' work. The man who has the great worry and tear and who suffers most mentally is the man who has to teach a large class in the city for about half the salary you are, under proposed scale, offering the man who teaches half the number in the country.

970. *Mr. Davidson.*] Can you give any opinion as to why so large a percentage of the pupil-teachers are women?—The females stop at school longer, and are more inclined to genteel occupations. They get the benefit of the education, and think they may do something in the interval, and go in for teaching. They are people above the class that go to service, and they stop at school.

971. The pupil-teachers, as a rule, are employed in the infant department—Standards I., II., and III.?—Yes.

972. And the teachers are women?—Yes.

973. Do you not think that as a natural consequence a much larger percentage of the pupil-teachers under any circumstances will be girls?—A larger percentage will.

974. Can you give any reason why boys have not entered the teaching service?—I think the occupation is judged principally from the standpoint of what they get when they enter the service. Boys have many openings, and can earn more money.

975. Do you not think the close attention required for study and work, together with the little time given to boys for recreation, has something to do with their disinclination to enter the service?—I do not think so. Indeed, they generally undertake extra study.

976. Do you not think that the few vacancies and the inadequate payment of teachers, particularly the junior assistants in the city schools and the teachers in the country districts, have had the effect of preventing parents from allowing boys to enter the teaching profession?—I do not think so. They never find these things out until they have been in the service a few years.

977. What is your experience as a teacher?—I was for three years and a half at Kakapuaka. I was headmaster in Pareora, South Canterbury. I was first assistant at the Waimate District High School at a salary of £177 and a small bonus, and I have been nearly ten years in the Normal School. I had charge of the weak ones in Standards IV. and V. for some time, and I have been teaching the Seventh for the last seven years.

978. What is your position on the staff of the Normal School?—Second male assistant.

979. You do a large amount of special work that is not done by any man in Otago occupying a similar position?—I cannot say that.

980. Do you think the list of successes achieved by you as second male assistant can be shown by any other man occupying a similar position?—I do not suppose such a list can be shown.

981. You saw that by scale No. 2 the staff is altered somewhat, and the suggested salaries are also higher than in No. 1?—Yes; but that is only part of the scale. The salaries of assistants are not shown.

982. In the event of a minimum salary for assistants of £110 being fixed in any colonial scale, you think it would be a distinct advance on the scale obtaining in many parts of the colony?—Yes.

983. *Mr. Stewart.*] In the list of salaries you compared, were not the teachers' salaries you gave us the salaries of juniors?—They were the minimum salaries paid to duly qualified teachers, some of whom have had sixteen years' experience.

984. Is it not unusual for a man with sixteen years' experience to occupy a junior position?—I have been teaching sixteen years myself, and I am just a grade above the junior.

985. Is it the minimum salary you were comparing?—Yes.

986. Was it the minimum salary of the other men that you took?—Yes.

987. It was not the maximum wage?—No.

988. Can teachers rise to higher salaries than £80 a year?—Yes.

989. The scale provides for their rising?—It does not provide for it in any way.

990. As a teacher, do you think it is a wise thing to pick out cases and make comparisons when you are dealing with a scale of this kind?—Yes, I think so. Provision should be made for the lower class of men in the service.

991. I do not ask you that. Is it wise to make comparisons, as you have done?—Yes, or I would not have done it.

992. You have spoken about extraneous duties outside school-hours?—I mentioned only one of these—the Bible class—as being performed outside school-hours.

993 Are you compelled to do that work?—Yes, I think so.

994. Are the services not voluntary?—I think not. They arise from the habit of the men. It is the nature of the teacher.

995. Are the duties you have specified generally considered to be the duties of assistant masters, forming part of the duty for which they are paid?—I consider them part of the duties. Anything in the training of a child I am bound in honour to do for the children.

996. You think they are part of the duties for which you are paid?—Yes.

997. *Mr. Hill.*] Are you required to be present during the giving of religious instruction?—I said that religious instruction was one of those things that must be given outside hours. We are not even asked to be present.

998. Are you present?—No. I am not quoting my own case, but I can produce a teacher in the room who will speak on that point.

999. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to pupil-teachers, you complain that under the proposed scale of salaries there will be no encouragement given to them to join the service?—I said that male pupil-teachers are apt to view the salary from the standpoint of the first year. They say, "What can I get to start with?" and a reduction of £10 is enough to prevent many from going in for teaching.

1000. Are you aware that in the majority of the educational districts of the colony the rate of pay to the pupil-teachers is about the same as this scale?—The result is they get men who grow up to do a different class of work. Two are often required where one will do with us.

1001. With regard to the living-wage, is it not a fact that there are a large number of male teachers in Otago getting no more than £70?—I think there may be reasons for certain men being in such positions.

1002. John Beattie, Pomahaka Downs; James Morland, Catlin's; Robert Huie, Tahakopa; John A. Gray, Glenore; John Kinder, Stony Creek; Albert James Ferguson, Whare Flat; and James Niven, Tomahawk, whose certificates range from C3 to E2, are men who are getting about £70 a year. They are really getting below a living-wage, are they not?—You will probably find that in their day some of these men have earned more than double the minimum wage.

1003. With regard to a comparison of the work done by a teacher in the country and an assistant teacher in the town, you maintain that there is greater responsibility, and that the work is more severe in the case of the assistant teacher in the town school than in the country school, where all the standards are taught?—When I was in the country school I did not know what teaching was, and the reports of my teaching were better than I could ever attain in the town school.

1004. Why are country teachers always gravitating towards the town?—Because they do not realise the nature of the work.

1005. When country teachers are appointed in the town do they wish to get back to the country again?—Yes, they often do.

1006. Taking the scale as a whole, do you not consider it is an improvement on what obtains even in Otago at the present time?—The scale for assistants is not stated, and I cannot, therefore, consider the scale as a whole.

1007. Do you think that teachers in Otago would prefer to do the work, arduous as it is, rather than suffer a reduction?—Undoubtedly.

1008. *Mr. Hogben.*] In Otago there are many assistant masters who have classes of about 80?—Yes.

1009. Do you not think the services of a pupil-teacher would be of value to such a master?—Yes, I think so.

1010. If he had a class of 80, would it not assist him to give him a pupil-teacher to do the more mechanical work?—The teacher must see the mechanical work, so that he may correct it.

1011. Do you mean to say that the assistant pupil-teacher in a large class is not worth having?—It is not worth the cost, to put it plainly.

1012. But, independently of cost, do you not consider it would be an assistance to a master in a class of 80 to have the services of a pupil-teacher?—I cannot consider it independently of cost.

1013. *The Chairman.*] What you specially wish to call attention to is the small salary paid to the assistant teachers?—They are not considered at all, and do not seem to be considered in any of the schemes.

1014. You think £110 should be the minimum paid to an assistant?—I would not think much of a man who would take less than that.

1015. What should be the minimum paid to a female assistant?—Our Institute has fixed £100, and I abide by that.

1016. You have also referred to what you think would be a reasonable difference in the salaries between various classes of assistants?—Yes.

1017. What do you think would be a reasonable difference between the pay of the headmaster and the first assistant?—I am working towards that class myself, and to answer the question might be like settling my own salary.

1018. Do you consider the duties of a headmaster are much more arduous than those of the first assistant, or require longer experience or greater ability?—I think the assistant should get from four-fifths to five-sixths of the salary of the headmaster.

1019. You think that in no case should an assistant be paid only half the salary of the headmaster, including allowances?—It depends on circumstances.

1020. As a matter of relative value, you think there should not be a difference of 50 per cent.?—I do not think so.

1021. Do you think it is reasonable that the headmaster should have house allowance, and the assistant no house allowance?—I think the headmaster should have a house.

1022. And what about the first assistant and house allowance?—It does not matter about house allowance if he is paid reasonably. I do not think I would be entitled to ask for a house.

1023. You would not object to it if you got it?—Yes, I would.

1024. With regard to boys and girls qualifying themselves by passing the Civil Service Examination, and so forth, do you find many girls go into the Civil Service?—Yes. In the six years I quoted fifty-eight passed the examination, half of whom were girls. Only two girls got into the service, and thirteen boys.

1025. With regard to girls, what is the proportion of girls to boys who enter the teaching profession?—In my own school it is about two boys to twenty-one girls.

1026. The majority of the boys go into the Civil Service, and the majority of the girls into the teaching profession?—Only a third of the boys who pass get appointments in the Civil Service, and very few girls. Nearly all the boys who apply as pupil-teachers get appointments.

1027. Do you think there is a scarcity of male teachers in the service at the present time?—No.

1028. If the suppy is equal to the demand, would it be wise to have more male teachers entering the service in the capacity of pupil-teachers?—I think the time is coming when a want will be felt.

1029. Do not many of the female teachers disappear from the service?—Yes, 80 per cent.

1030. Do you think the teachers in the country schools are sufficiently paid?—The teacher in the small school is not sufficiently paid, but when you get up to a certain grade too much, I think, is made of the cry of town against country.

1031. What should be the minimum salary in a school of from 15 to 20?—Not less than £110 and a house.

1032. And in the case of a female teacher?—In the smallest class I would say £100.

1033. Would it be reasonable to give the same salary to the junior assistant in the town school as to the teacher in the small country school?—Yes, in a small school like that.

1034. *Mr. Hill.*] I understood you to say that in Otago you would not divide a class of 80 pupils into two, but you would in other districts?—I said a teacher might not manage that number in other districts, but in Otago he could manage them.

1035. Seeing you make such a statement as that, do you consider there should be a differential scale of salaries for Otago teachers only?—I do not say they are superior men, but they are more used to handling larger classes. I do not advocate a differential scale for Otago.

1036. Would you prefer a colonial scheme of promotion to a local scheme of promotion?—I have not considered that question. One of my objections is that a colonial scale does not provide for promotion.

1037. Would you like a colonial scheme of promotion?—It would depend on the scheme.

1038. *Mr. Davidson.*] You say it is impossible to formulate a colonial scheme: is that your own opinion or the opinion of the Institute you represent?—In their report the Institute indicate what their opinion is, and my opinion is that the time is not ripe for a colonial scale.

C. G. Smeaton, representing Assistant Masters, examined.

Mr. Smeaton: On the subject of staffing, the first consideration I would point to is that of small schools whose average attendance runs from 30 to 50. I taught for some time in these schools, and, while I do not wish to say much through the whole field of staffing, I could, if I were asked, say a little about the necessity for employing assistants in schools of that grade. I was inclined to say, before I heard the other speakers, that there was not much need of assistance up to the period of an average of 49, but after listening to the remarks made by previous witnesses I have come to the same conclusion as to the necessity for providing an increase. We have fallen into line with the earlier witnesses, and think that, with an average attendance of 45, it is a fair thing to expect the work to be done by one teacher, but we all have come to the conclusion that the employment of assistance is a practical necessity after the period of 45. Up to 100 the work of the school might be carried on by a head-teacher *plus* an assistant. After the average attendance is 101 onward another assistant is required. The bulk of the assistant teachers have agreed that these figures can be accepted as substantially correct. With regard to the class of schools running from 250 to 450, we have fallen into line with the views of the Institute to this extent, that we consider that where there are five assistants the first, second, and third should be males, and where there are four the first and second should be males. With regard to the question of salaries attaching to the different positions, we differ from the Institute very slightly. I think Mr. Marshall, speaking for the Institute this morning, said that we claimed that the minimum salary for any assistant should be £110. That does not quite represent our position. We thought £120 quite low enough. We did not draw up a scale of salaries to be allotted—or, rather, we did do so, and it was finally rejected, and we thought it would be a fairer thing to assume that between the position of first assistant and second there should be a financial difference of £40, and between the second and third £30. Other circumstances might operate in warranting a change, but the minimum salary should be £120. We thought it possible circumstances might arise where the Education Boards might raise it to a higher figure, and we thought that might very well be left to the discretion of the Boards. With regard to the position of schools more advanced, we have come to the conclusion that it would be a very fair thing to raise the salaries of the assistants in other provinces, certainly up to the past Otago level. We think it a very unfair thing, and improper in the interests of education in the colony as a whole, to allow them to be maintained in their old position. I am referring now strictly to the provinces outside Otago. We have been led to believe, in the first place, that a scheme had been devised which would be looked upon as something more than a working basis, but when the Inspector-General's scheme was brought down and was likely to be carried out we were considerably exercised about it; we thought it might be made very much better and more workable if certain alterations were made in it. However, we were told two things: First, that the Commission were in no way identified with it; and, secondly, that a modification of the scheme has been brought forward, and the more we have heard of that modified scheme the more are we inclined to look favourably upon it. As we are led to believe that the assistants as a body are not likely to suffer any reduction at all, it would be wasting time to go into the reductions proposed by the first scale at any great length. I will read through as shortly as I can a memorandum that will show some of the hardships that might have occurred to us. Taking the first assistants of Otago, the average salary at present is £214; the average salary proposed, £185; average length of service, sixteen years and five years—twenty-one years; average number taught, 62 pupils; reductions range from £68 to £10; that is a 13-per-cent. reduction all round. It would be looked upon as a very serious reduction if the head of a commercial firm were to propose a 13-per-cent. reduction all round. All the first assistants in Otago are married men, save 5 per cent. Now take the second assistants: The average salary at present is £174; average salary proposed, £110; average length of service, eleven years and five years—sixteen years; average number of pupils, 68; reductions, from £65 to £50, or a reduction ranging from 25 to 36 per cent. The junior assistants: Average salary at present, £117 17s. 6d.; average proposed, £82; length of service, six years and a half and five years—eleven years and a half; average number taught, 72 pupils; reductions, from £45 to £30, equal to a 22-per-cent. reduction all round. I have here a list showing the matter in detail, but it would take a long time to read it.

Mr. Stewart: It is in all our hands.

Mr. Smeaton: Then, I may assume that it will be read. Take the case of McLean, of George Street: His salary is £240. He has received as the maximum £260; minimum, £242. It is reduced to £230. He has served twelve years as first and eleven years as second, and the proposed

salary is lower than that he received as second assistant teacher fourteen years ago. Mr. Line, of the Union Street School, is at present receiving £240, while it is proposed in the first scale that he should receive £210. His qualification is A1; he has to teach the Sixth and Seventh Standards, and has been in the service eighteen years. Mr. Booth at present receives a salary of £210; he would be reduced to £160, and he gave up £170 and a free house, equal to £205, to come into town for promotion. He is lower than he was sixteen years ago, and through no fault of his own. The second assistants, it will be seen, are considerably worse off than the first. The general bulk of the third assistants are at present receiving salaries from £175 to £180; £175 would be the average salary, and under the proposed scale it would be £110. The teachers do not consider that very much attention should be paid to the implied promise made some years ago, when the capitation grant was reduced; but they have waited for fourteen years, and they think it is a great pity, even if it is unavoidable, that the 5s. could not be reinstated without their having to suffer a reduction. As most teachers consider their work of a particularly trying and arduous nature, especially as they have to deal with animate instead of inanimate matter, they consider that a special reason why they should be adequately paid for their services. The first and second assistants, and the first, second, and third assistants in many schools, have to undertake a number of different duties—singing in group classes, cadet drill, and other things. I suppose I need not refer to these matters, but altogether they make the work of the first and second assistants by no means a light matter. We think that these considerations ought to weigh strongly with the members of the Commission in leading the Commission to frame a scheme which will not provide for any serious reductions. Even if under the proposed scheme one or two assistants should be appointed to each of the large schools, the male assistants claim that whatever relief may be granted to the staff as a whole, and whatever benefit might accrue generally to the cause of education, their labours would be lightened to a very small degree—that is to say, for reasons obvious to most headmasters, the bulk of any extra assistance granted must inevitably go towards lightening the labours of the lady teachers in the very large classes they have to work with at present. Several speakers have already referred to the comparative scale of wages—that is, they have instituted comparisons between the salaries earned by teachers and the salaries earned by artisans of different kinds; and they claim, with a good deal of weight, I think, that these considerations take point in this direction: that the teachers should not have their salaries reduced. There is not any manner of doubt about the trend of educational work in its bearing upon teaching. It is certain that only with close study can the best sort of work be got out of teachers, and that that study and work leaves them unfit for other occupations. I claim that if a man will live up to the ideal of his work as a teacher he must become more or less unfitted for business. Some day or other teachers may be called upon to leave the teaching profession, and if they do that they must have a large sum of money to invest in some form of business in which they are not required to take an active part. If they have only a little they must invest it in something with which they have to do, and if the average teacher were to pit his ability in business against that of the ordinary business-man he would be bought in one street, and sold in the next. That unfitness to deal with commercial men in other walks of life is, I maintain, solely due to the fact that there is something in his calling that unfits him to compete with business-men on equal terms. There is another question, a more delicate matter, I should like to refer to, but we have not given the thing sufficient attention to go into it at length. I should like to refer to the question of pensions. I would have been pleased if some one outside the ranks of teachers had referred to it. There is much that could be said on the question, and in this connection I would again mention our unfitness to deal with commercial matters. We are sure to be faulty business-men, and altogether unfitted to go into business after we leave the ranks of the teaching profession. From another point of view, it is necessary for us to leave our profession at a much earlier age than that at which most men retire from other professions. When a teacher reaches the age of from fifty-five to sixty, and has to pit himself against younger men and more enthusiastic men, who have achieved a good deal of proficiency in their work—younger men with health and strength in their favour, who have picked up the best ideas with regard to the advancement of education—is it likely that men in the decline of life, even with the best intentions, can hope to succeed in the race against the young men whom they will have all around them? It is inevitable that the younger men must drive the elder ones out of the teaching profession, and unless they have saved a good deal of money, or have some particularly great gifts which enable them to deal with the men they must meet in the outside world, they are not fit to go into any other line of life. Therefore I put these considerations before the Commission with a view to their looking into the question of pensions, possibly with a view to recommending to the General Government that some form of pension or superannuation scheme is a necessity. My colleagues have thought, that if a colonial scheme of salaries and staffing should exist, a colonial scheme of promotion should be devised too. I cannot quite fall into line with that. I do not know on what lines it would work out. We have seen an instance of it in Victoria, and I do not think it was a great success. However, I must fall into line with my colleagues on that, and submit that possibly a colonial scheme of promotions would be a good thing.

1039. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Have you studied the amended scale?—I have looked at the figures.

1040. Does it meet with your approval?—Generally speaking, I think there is a good deal to be satisfied with in the amended scale.

1041. If adopted you think it would meet the case?—I have not seen any of the figures in the second scale bearing upon schools with an average attendance of over 320. If the scale of salaries is maintained at something like the Otago rate, as indicated by the Inspector-General, I think it would prove very satisfactory indeed to the assistants.

1042. *Mr. Hogben.*] I made a statement on Saturday that it would be maintained with an extra expenditure of £930?—We were alive to the fact that there was a big doubt on the financial aspect. Any recommendation you might bring before Parliament might result in the impossibility

of the scheme being maintained as favourable. We had doubts whether any recommendations by the Commission would succeed in inducing Parliament to vote the money to carry out a liberally framed scheme.

The Chairman: There is a big element of risk.

1043. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Your opinion is that capitation should be granted on the old scheme?—If possible.

1044. You referred to the question of old-age pensions: have you thought out any method of working?—No.

1045. You have not thought of the method of the teachers contributing something and the Government something?—No, but we should be thankful to do it.

1046. Have you not had some hint of that kind on the subject?—The information we had came to us so late that unfortunately we had not time to deal with it properly.

1047. *Mr. Davisdon.*] What has been your teaching experience?—About twenty years.

1048. You have told the Commission you have had experience in small schools?—Yes.

1049. What is the average attendance in the school you refer to?—I should say it would run to 49.

1050. And the teaching staff?—I was sole teacher.

1051. In your opinion, what is the highest average number a sole teacher should teach?—About 45.

1052. Have you considered, in making that statement, the probable introduction into such schools of the kindergarten methods and manual training?—I have never given the subject of kindergarten and manual training any consideration.

1053. If it were to be the case that kindergarten methods and manual training were to be introduced in such a school, do you think then that a sole teacher could manage to teach efficiently as high a number as 45?—Very likely he could if two other conditions were brought in to make it possible.

1054. What are those conditions?—I should say it would be a very good thing to reduce the number of subjects, for one condition; and the other would be to modify the amount taught in each subject, or, at least, in some subjects. Such subjects as reading, writing, arithmetic, and English, including composition, would need to be taught pretty well as at present, but a modification might be made in teaching history, grammar, and such forms of elementary science as are taught in country schools.

1055. Apart from the question of salary, if a mistress were allowed at 40 instead of at 45, do you think that would be in the interests of education?—It might not be financially in the interests of education, but I have no doubt it would be an advantage.

1056. In this grade 420 to 480, it is your opinion there should be at least three male assistants on the staff of the schools?—Yes.

1057. *Mr. Stewart.*] In your evidence-in-chief you spoke of added duties: will you kindly define them?—The added duties are not found to the same extent in all the large schools. For instance, in a school like Albany Street—and I am told this is the practice in most of the larger schools—they have a considerable amount of time taken up with cadet-drill, shooting-practice, and swimming-practice; and that they hold swimming-matches even on Saturdays; and that the teachers attend the practices and matches, and give all the help they can.

1058. Do I understand you that these duties are out of school-hours?—I cannot tell you what the practice is in Albany Street, but I presume the cadet-drill is out of school-hours, cadet shooting-practice and all; and, of course, as I have said, the swimming-practice is done on Saturdays—at least, I know there have been swimming-matches held on Saturdays and attended by an assistant master.

1059. Is there any compulsion in the attendance?—I do not think there is any compulsion, but they have to attend, all the same.

1060. You mean to say the compulsion is indirect?—Yes; moral.

1061. No one actually saying they must be there?—No; I do not think anybody can go so far as to distinctly order a man to go there, but it is worth a man's while to go.

1062. Suppose he did not?—I leave you, as a head-teacher, to suggest the probable results of any teacher refusing to obey your instructions.

1063. Since you have referred to it in that way, I may say that I should be the last man in the world to think of even making it worth a man's while to do so?—But you will admit there are men who would.

1064. With regard to the calculations you have placed in our hands, is the average salary set down here calculated on the salary set down against that rank of assistants, or does it take into consideration the footnote which speaks of the alternation?—It takes the alternation into consideration.

1065. Really, the average salary worked out on that basis, in consequence of a female coming in, would go down and be ranked a second rather than a third, or a third rather than a fourth?—That is correct.

1066. *Mr. Luke.*] You are an assistant?—That is so.

1067. Are you in favour of a colonial scale of staffing and salaries?—Personally, I am very well satisfied with the Otago Education Board, and do not see any reason for a change; but during the sittings of the Commission I have modified my opinion very considerably.

1068. I suppose you are of opinion that, if there is to be a colonial scale of salaries, the salaries of the assistants under other Education Boards should be levelled up to those paid in the Otago District?—Yes; I think it is a great hardship to the teachers in the other education districts that they should have been left so long—so many years—under what I may call a grossly unfair system of payment for the work they have been compelled to do.

1069. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you not consider a colonial scale of salaries would have more stability than a scale adopted by any particular Board?—I do not know. It would just have the stability of the particular Government at the time.

1070. Is it not the fact that the Otago Board has altered its staffing and its scale of salaries during your experience?—It has several times. It has taken the bonuses, and there was a reduction some little while ago. I have no recollection when my salary was cut down. It was so small an amount that I cannot remember.

1071. Are you aware that the Auckland Board has adopted a new scale which means a reduction all round?—No.

1072. When the Auckland Board could do that, even while the Commission is going round to investigate the matter, is it not possible that the Otago or any other Board could do the same?—Certainly.

1073. Then, while the colonial scale is dependent in any case upon parliamentary sanction, will it not have more stability than scales under the Education Boards, seeing that any one Board can alter its scale?—What is the difference between thirteen reductions and one big reduction covering the thirteen districts?

1074. With regard to the payment of teachers based on the average attendance of the previous quarter: do you consider that the payment should be based on the quarter's attendance, or that you should take into consideration the four quarters, so that the teacher might know what his salary was going to be at the beginning of the year?—I am not much in favour of its being based upon the quarter immediately preceding. I should say that probably a six months' average attendance was fair both to Boards and teachers.

1075. I think you made some remark that there was a possibility of the Legislature not adopting the recommendations of the Commission, if they thought the amount involved was too high. Is it not a fact that when a scale is drawn up and adopted by the Legislature, the capitation allowance will disappear, and the difference will simply be whether the money is sent on to the Boards, or whether the department pays the teachers?—Provided the money is passed by Parliament, I do not see that it makes much difference; the only thing we have much doubt about is whether, with the increase of population in the colony, the Government will be found willing to bring down a scheme and prepared to pay for it.

1076. Am I to infer that with the increase of population there will be a large number of non-paying schools established; that there will be such a number of them as will more than counterbalance the increase of population in the towns?—No, I do not suppose that will be so for a moment.

1077. Then, if we were to draw up a scale based upon a £4 capitation, the increase of population would not interfere with the proportionate amount?—It may not.

1078. *Mr. Hill.*] You said just now that the payment—the system of payment—in various districts was grossly unfair?—I could not give the figures for my statement, but perhaps I may state that, looking over the Inspector-General's report rather hurriedly, I saw that in many schools in other provinces the salaries paid are considerably lower than obtain in Otago. They are working for lower salaries in other provinces, and, as we consider we are not overpaid, any other system of payment that is much lower must be very unfair.

1079. You simply refer to salaries received in education districts other than Otago?—Yes.

1080. From that I understand you to prefer the present system, which is now operating here. Do you think the staffing sufficient?—It has been sufficient in Otago.

1081. You could not speak of any other instance?—Only from hearsay.

1082. You have no experience of the management of a school, say, below 100?—Not as assistant.

JOHN REID, B.A., representing Assistant Teachers, examined.

Mr. Reid: My remarks will be directed against the first proposed colonial scale. As that was the one before us when I was considering the question, that is the target at which I am aiming all my complaints. The second assistants, as you can see from the proposed scale, have, I think, the greatest burden, the greatest grievances. We are to be reduced not only in salary but in status: that is, from being second assistants, which is rather a good position under the Otago Education Board, we are to be reduced to—we do not know what. One member of the Commission yesterday said that we could find positions elsewhere. The statement you have before you shows, however, distinctly that the salaries of such positions would be reduced from an average of, I think, £174 down to an average of £110. I may say I am the secretary for the assistants. If you saw the letters I have received in reply to my circular, from which this statement is made up—if you could see the burden of injustice that was going to be placed upon the second assistants as shown by those letters—you would feel for them more than any words I can employ will cause you to do. We have now an amended scale, and it is shown that the assistants as a whole are not to be reduced; but I want to know if the second assistants are to lose their status? The others are to be levelled up to the Otago scale, but the great point with me is, what is to become of the twelve or thirteen second assistants in Otago, who receive about £165 each? Is there a guarantee that these second assistants will not lose their status, as well as that they will not be reduced to £110? There is the verbal statement that we are to be levelled up, but I am quite sure a great many of the assistants do not know where they stand.

Mr. Hogben: I can answer that question at once. The calculations have been made to allow them to maintain their present status. In fact, I think the second assistants absorb the total amount available.

Mr. Reid: The colonial scale of salaries has had a great deal of attention from the assistant masters. When we called the meeting there were from thirty to forty assistants present, and if we had taken a vote, with the great scare we had received, two-thirds would have voted against the

colonial scale. Now that a guarantee has been given that we are not to be reduced, I believe you would get a larger number to say they believed in a colonial scale. I believe the best way would be to send back the petition that was sent up some little time ago, and see how many would sign it now. I believe some of the assistants got such a scare about the colonial scale that they would not be quite so quick in signing the petition again. As has been pointed out, if there is a colonial scale of salaries there should be a colonial system of promotion, and a colonial scale of holidays, because I believe up North they get far more holidays than we do in Otago. I may say that I have had some experience with the Otago Education Board, and I venture to say that, with all the readjustments and changes from month to month and quarter to quarter, never in all my experience, or in the experience of any assistant teacher, did the Board make such a wholesale readjustment of salaries as is put before us in the colonial scale. They have gone in for decreases sometimes and for increases sometimes, but never have they startled us out of our wits by putting before us such a scale, and giving us such a scare as we got from the colonial one. I can see that the trend is to colonialism—that is, to a colonial scale—and, while the assistants admit that a readjustment must come to bring everything into line, we do not admit that any scale like this is necessary. If this is a foretaste or a foreshadowing of what is to come under colonialism, we want to enter a protest, and to say that, while we admit there may be a little readjustment in the progress towards colonialism, we do not admit that there should be such an injustice as this. I want to ask, why have the assistants been singled out for special prominence in the matter of reductions? Since my name appeared in the paper as one who was to suffer a reduction of £65, people have said to me, "Man, you must have had a princely income!" I am not advocating that the headmasters should be reduced, but surely if there is to be reduction there are the great prizes of the headmasterships you could consider, and there are others you could reduce. I should like to ask why we, the first, second, and junior assistants, are singled out as the target against which the suggested colonial scale is to aim its bullets. We have special difficulties and burdens as assistants that we do not really think have ever been realised by the Otago Education Board nor by the central department. I want to speak about the extraneous subjects. The last witness was asked what they were. They are coming into the schools one after another; they are introduced time and again, and they are not provided for in the syllabus, or contemplated by the department or the Inspectors; but they come in one by one until they almost form part of the syllabus. I do not complain — we assistants do not complain that the syllabus is overburdened. I say that with good methods and good mapping-out of the work, with energy and industry, I believe the syllabus could be got through, and that we could thoroughly perfect our work—*i.e.*, if we have not too many demonstrations. But then other things come in supplying work in addition to the syllabus. We believe that the Inspectors in Otago read the syllabus more strictly than is done in the North, but I do not complain of that. There is not an assistant complains about the amount of work; in fact, we are rather proud of our high standard. I have heard Otago teachers boasting of the high ideals of their Inspectors, and we are proud that they demand such effective service. Our complaint is not that we are between the devil and the deep sea, but that we have more than two parties to consider. We have the Otago Board's Inspectors and the parents of the children; and there is a greater bugbear yet, and that is the School Committeeman. Each of you knows that the School Committeeman understands little about teaching ability. He comes to the school and looks over the roll; the number on the standard-roll and on the whole school-roll is the criterion of the majority of these men as to who are efficient teachers. It seems as if the day would come in Otago, and in all our large centres, when we will have to practise not the art of teaching, but the dastardly art of taking children away from other schools. That is going to be the great art of the future—the art of drawing children from other and contiguous schools, so as to please the Committees. I am not blaming the headmasters, the Inspectors, or the Boards. I say it is done to please the Committees. For this purpose our Committees have introduced certain baits. What are these baits? The first is gymnastics. Then there is the bait of dancing in some schools, also the baits of shooting, swimming, and cooking. All these extra subjects will cut into our time if we do not look well after it. You say there is no compulsion. I admit that there is no compulsion; but if these things draw away the children from schools—if you do not take part in them you are a marked man among School Committees, and they have no further use for you. I have Mr. Spence's authority for giving you the following: On Friday morning the first and second assistants take gymnastics for one hour; then there is swimming——

Mr. Davidson: I think it is wrong that any single school should be singled out and brought before the Commissioners.

Mr. Reid: On one night a week in most of the city schools we have to drop work promptly and go on with the Bible-class afterwards.

A Member of the Commission: You have "got to"?

Mr. Reid: I was the greatest sinner, seeing that I was one of the first to undertake such work; but by-and-by I saw that in one school the Committee had actually recommended the headmaster to see that one assistant was present during the Bible-class, and from that moment I saw that I was damaging my fellow-assistants, and I desisted at once, because I saw that the Committees were using my action as a precedent for others. On Saturday morning last year, as an assistant, I had to be on the football field from half-past 9 till about 12, and in the cricket season we have to be on the cricket ground for the same hours. On Saturdays and holidays there are trips arranged by train, and we have to go. We have to attend to these things, and very often are out of pocket. I put these things before you to show you we have no right to be singled out. I believe an assistant in the town has a good deal more work than a headmaster in the country, with 40 or 45 pupils. We are called upon to do a day's work, and then we are almost morally compelled to do these things afterwards. I intended to set before you a comparison of wages, but I think you have had almost enough of that to-day. I see that the trend is towards colonialism, and that

education by-and-by will be one of the great departments of the Civil Service. If we are going to be branded as Civil servants we wish you, in framing the scale of salaries, to see that they are not made lower than in other departments. You will agree that the teachers, on the whole, are quite equal to the Civil servants in any other department, and I am quite sure that you will put down as liberal a sum towards this new department of the Civil Service as there is for the Post and Telegraph Department, the Railway or the Insurance Department. When we looked into these we were prepared to find that all the rates of pay were much higher than was proposed in the colonial scale for teachers, but there was one thing we were not prepared to find, and that is that these rates of pay are much higher than under the Otago Education Board. We were not prepared to find that the Civil servants were paid better than the servants of the Otago Education Board. Before I say anything about their salaries I want to say that in all these other branches of the Civil Service they have distinct advantages that we have not. In the other branches I do not think they have such arduous work, and with the exception of the Insurance Department there is no other department that competition enters into. Now, you know that competition makes life hard, that it makes the work more arduous, and in connection with our work competition is coming in like a flood day after day. In the other branches of the Civil Service they have ways of increasing their salaries without promotion. I cannot get an increase of my salary unless I am promoted. If I stay a second assistant for twenty years I cannot get an increase. There are these things in the Civil Service which we do not have. In teaching, our apprenticeship is arduous and poorly paid. When it is finished, instead of going into good employment, we have to go to a training-college or to the university. We have to buy our own books, and get very poor pay in return for our services. In two Acts relating to departments of the Civil Service, when a scheme was proposed it was provided that it should not act in a retrospective manner—that it should not have effect upon those already in their positions. The one Act is the Post and Telegraph Regulations Act, and the other the Government Departments Classification Act. These show distinctly that when the classification scales were brought in they were not allowed to act in a retrospective manner; but by the proposed colonial scale you bring in a new scale that will act extensively in a retrospective manner, because it reduces some of us who are already in the service from £165 to £110, and others just as badly. If you will look at this you will see that some of the salaries are now lower than they were from thirteen to seventeen years ago, and now there is going to be a further reduction, though the cost of living is very much greater than it used to be, and the pay to all other professions and trades is being raised. Some of the second assistants are married men, and most people are saying that others ought to be. Then, it should be remembered that they were enticed into the service of the Education Board by seeing a certain scale of salaries before them. They have passed the best years of their lives in the Board's service, and if they are cast aside they cannot go into other avenues of employment. What is to be the result? The result will be, as I can say from having seen letters from different assistants, that many of the best of them will leave the service if the proposed scale is brought in. Again, there is no finality to our work. I do not think there is any other profession in which you have to do so much to keep up with the times. The necessary books and training costs a good deal of money, and there is constant strain. Many of the first assistants have made great sacrifices to come into the towns, thinking they were getting promotion, after they had served in the country. This is a point I think some members of the Commission do not know. Most of the first and second assistants have been in the country; some of them are married and have children; their pay is lower than what they were getting years ago, and now it is proposed to reduce them again. I beg to hand in a comparative statement of salaries paid to first assistants [Exhibit 56].

1083. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] As to the question of the Bible-classes, the Committees require the teachers to let the children away sharp?—Yes.

1084. Was it required that the teachers should accompany the children to the Bible-classes?—As I pointed out, I was the chief offender in that; but when I saw in the Arthur Street report that the headmaster was recommended to send an assistant teacher with the class, I considered that was showing there was going to be compulsion.

1085. I suppose that since then you have kept away?—Yes.

1086. That is outside what the department requires?—Yes.

1087. What kind of dancing do you refer to?—There was dancing in my school, and when I went there the assistant, very often a pupil-teacher, was required to stay till 5 o'clock teaching the girls dancing.

1088. Are the pupil-teachers required to remain?—No.

1089. Did you sign for a colonial scale?—I am sorry to say I did. The petition was put before me when I was at work and in a hurry.

1090. Regarding the Saturday excursions, are they compulsory or spontaneous? Mr. Stewart takes a botanical class?—That is a different thing. I always take my boys out camping during the Easter holidays.

1091. There was an allusion you made to reductions of salaries by the Education Board of Otago: do you think the Board does as much justice as possible to the teachers?—I think it does, with the exception of one or two in the back blocks.

1092. *Mr. Davidson.*] If it could be shown to you, Mr. Reid, that the colonial scale of staffing is more liberal than that at present obtaining in Otago, and that the colonial scale of salaries would be at least equal to that obtaining in Otago at the present time, without any reduction of status to the teachers, would you then be in favour of the colonial system?—No.

1093. Why?—For reasons that I do not think I need put before you.

H. HARRAWAY, Chairman of Otago Education Board, examined.

Mr. Harraway: I am afraid I cannot throw very much additional light on the subject. The thing seems to me to have been thoroughly threshed out from all quarters and in all directions, and the few remarks I have to make will be by way of suggestion, as to amendments of the Act that I think will prove of material assistance to the teaching profession. First of all, I would say that I think every candidate for admission to the teaching profession should be called upon to pass a medical examination, and to produce a certificate showing a thoroughly sound constitution and freedom from all physical defects. I think it is absolutely necessary this should be done. Some two years ago the Otago Board determined to abolish the bonus system then in operation, and that necessitated a new scale of salaries being framed. I was one of the Committee appointed by the Board to go into the matter. We had many sittings, and devoted a lot of time to trying to formulate a scheme acceptable to the teachers and yet within the means of the Board. The Board at the time was in very straitened circumstances, suffering from a very heavy overdraft. We found our expenditure was exceeding our income, and as we had no means of taxing or rating anybody we had to cut down our expenditure at once. The teachers of Otago accepted the scale as being fairl reasonable considering our circumstances, but I may say it was the feeling of the Committee and of the Board that it was only a temporary scale, because there are several classes of teachers who are underpaid. This last year Parliament passed a vote for the purpose of giving some additions to the salaries of teachers, and the department sent to us asking for any suggestions we might choose to make as to the allocation of this vote. I am sorry to say only a very small amount came to Otago, only £500 for the quarter. We were entitled to more. The Board took the matter into very serious consideration, and recommended that the whole of this vote should be allocated to different teachers in the schools having an average attendance under 51, and to the mistresses of schools where the average attendances were from 51 to 100. The whole of the money was allocated to these teachers—at least, that was our recommendation. I have had prepared a statement showing in one column the average attendance, the present salary in another column, and in another the salary recommended by the Board upon the distribution of the supplementary grant, and the salary proposed under the colonial scale. You will find that, if the money was allocated as we have suggested, in most cases the teachers would be better paid than they will be if a colonial scale is adopted on the basis of the one laid before the Commission. I am very pleased that this is so. I feel that our teachers in Otago in the higher schools have very little to complain of. I think the great hardships are found where the attendance averages under 51, and we have tried by our suggestions to impress upon the Government and the department that they should allocate the money in the way we have suggested. If that was done I believe it would be carried out on nearly right lines, and in the end would prove acceptable to the profession throughout Otago. This scale I shall be very pleased to put in if you will allow me [Exhibit 58]. I feel, speaking as a layman, that such a scale would be acceptable to the service, and, when saying that, I may state that if the Otago Education Board had £4 capitation grant we could pay the teachers the salaries indicated in the Board's proposals, and we could also give to our Committees the £1,000 deducted from their allowances, and also provide for some additional teaching-power that is required in the larger schools. I wish to refer to the staffing of the schools. I have not been able to convince myself that our schools with an average attendance of 51 are understaffed. I think that any clever, energetic teacher, with the assistance of a monitor, should be quite capable of teaching a school with an average attendance of any number up to 51, and I have not been able to convince myself that teachers in such positions require further assistance. I think that the figures supplied by the secretary, showing the enormous amount of money required to make the necessary alterations in the schools where the colonial scale provides for an increased staff, will probably cause the Commission to come to the conclusion that they need not go further in that direction—the amount would be so great the money could not be provided. I think the Inspectors' reports on the schools referred to show that the teaching where there has been an average attendance of 51 has been of a satisfactory character, and that goes to show that the schools have not been understaffed. I know that in the report submitted to the Commission by the Teachers' Institute the teachers to a large extent support my opinion. They suggest they are understaffed only after the attendance reaches 46, and then ask for assistance. There is not much difference between 46 and 51, and I think that bears out my contention that these schools are not understaffed. I think relief could be given to the teachers of these schools, if they are overworked, by reducing the number of subjects taught. There is one point that I feel very keenly about, and I think it is a backward step—that is, the proposal to reduce the salaries of the male assistant teachers. I think that is a retrograde step, and hope the Commission will not see their way to recommend it. I am sure, from my experience in Otago, that if this is brought about we shall certainly lose the flower of the young teachers now in the service of the Board. We have already the greatest difficulty in keeping up a sufficient teaching-power in the male department. I think, at the present moment, if we wanted a relieving male teacher there is no one available. In many cases we have to send females instead of males, because the list is exhausted. If the proposed reductions are carried I have no hesitation in saying that you will drive out of the service some of the best assistant teachers we have. There is another matter I wish to refer to. A system has been introduced into the new scale of what is called penalising those whose certificates are below the certificates assigned to the positions they hold. I think this would be a gross injustice to a very large number of our teachers, and many of our most deserving teachers, too. I have no doubt you will approve of that remark when I read the statement showing how few in the service can aspire to any of these certificates. I am speaking of head-teachers only. We have only two in the service with A1 certificates; only seventeen with B1 and B2 certificates; only twelve in the whole service acting as head-teachers with C1 certificates, if you go no further. I will take the large schools round Dunedin with an average attendance

of from 303 to 700. These are the certificates of the head-teachers now running these schools: two B1, three C1, and eight D1; and I do not think any one can say that these schools are not thoroughly and efficiently staffed, and the work well done by the men holding the D1 certificates. It is only the opinion of a layman, and may not be worth anything, but my experience shows me—and it is a lengthened one now—that it does not follow because a man possesses very high qualifications himself he can instruct others. Very often it is the other way. In Otago alone we have found institutions where some masters holding very high qualifications have been the rankest duffers as teachers. In all sorts of trades and handicrafts the same thing applies. I have seen some of the most skilful of tradesmen who could not take an apprentice and teach him his trade. I think if that proposal is followed up the very greatest injustice will be done to our teachers. There is another matter I desire to mention. Perhaps I am a little old-fashioned, but it has been suggested to have women head-teachers with male assistants under them. I entirely disagree with that. I think, in all schools where there are two teachers the head-teacher should be a male. Now a few words about the capitation grant: While, as I have said, we can carry on in Otago with a capitation grant of £4 per head, I am quite alive to the fact that they cannot do so in smaller districts, and I think those smaller districts should have an extra grant; but in Otago the large number of very large schools return a large profit, which keeps the small country schools going. In districts where they are not blessed with these large schools the Boards cannot carry on with a capitation grant of £4, and I should be pleased if the Government could see their way to grant them extra assistance. Another matter has caused me great anxiety at times. We have schools in Otago—and I dare say the same applies to other districts—in what I may call outlandish places, where a lady teacher has the position, and the nearest female neighbour is three or four miles away. The other day a lady teacher visited me and asked me to do all I could to get her transferred. She is living at the top of a mountain at the back of the Taieri, and she declared to me that she could not see the smoke from her neighbour's chimney. She has been two or three years there. I ask you to picture to yourselves the horrible life that must be to a mistress. I think this should be taken into consideration in the colonial scheme and provision specially made for the staffing of these schools. You know there are bad men of all classes, and this country is roamed over from side to side by rabbiters. These men do their work at night for a great portion of the year, and when they sell their rabbits unfortunately some of them will indulge in liquor. I leave you to reflect on the danger there is in leaving women in isolation on the tops of those mountains. I say that this is a thing that ought not to be, and I am saying this in the hope that some good will come from it. I have settled the matter in my own mind very sharply, and have positively refused to send teachers to such places. When asked to send a female relieving-teacher I ask, where is the nearest neighbour, and can she get comfortable accommodation, and if the replies are unsatisfactory I ask myself, would I send my own daughter there, and if my conscience says I would not, then I will not send another's daughter. One or two things I ought to mention, and of these one is the irregular attendance at school. This is a matter that bears largely upon the salaries paid to teachers. I have a return showing the average weekly roll for the year, in another column the average attendance for the year, and in another the number of children absent and the percentage of children absent. In 1897 we had 2,780 absent from the schools; in 1898, 1,986; in 1899, 3,196; and in 1900, 2,673. Now, you can easily see that the teachers suffer very largely, because they are paid upon the average attendance. I maintain that the Government should immediately take steps to amend the clauses in the Act referring to this, and try through the Truancy Act, or by some other way, to bring about a better state of affairs. If the Truancy Act is brought into operation by the Government, and made ever so strict, that will not affect the man who is anxious for the welfare of his children; it is the fellow who does not care whether his children are educated or not that is reached, and I should not care much how we reached him. We find that children are only required to attend six times every week if the school is open nine times. I think it should be raised two attendances all round. It is a difficult matter to get the truancy clauses to work. I find there are two classes of truants—those on the school-roll and those who are not. Regarding those not on the school-rolls, it is necessary to send notice to the parents, and if they will not send their children to school, then under another clause they must be summoned. I think that ought to be altered and rendered more effective, and not so cumbrous. We want to reach the man who does not care a rap whether he sends his children to school or not. This was impressed upon me by what I heard in Central Otago. I was complaining about the attendance at a certain school, and was told of a man living just outside the two-mile radius. This man had two girls under school-age, who were away on the mountains rabbiting with their father and living in the same tent with him, and the Board could not touch him. I suggest to you, if this is within your order of reference, that you should make a recommendation that the truancy clauses should be made more stringent, and should be rendered less difficult to bring into operation.

1094. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you approve of the plan of allowing Otago £4 capitation and allowing the district to work out its own destiny—permitting the peculiarities of other districts to graduate the amount they should get?—I have shown that we could easily carry on in Otago. I am quite satisfied of that.

1095. With the £4?—Yes; I am perfectly satisfied the Board can pay the salaries stated in the scale put in by me, and can give the extra £1,000 to the Committees. There is a subject that has been overlooked. When speaking of the staffing of the schools, I omitted to say that I think some of the large schools in Otago are understaffed, and I think the Board, with a capitation grant of £4, can provide for ten extra teachers to go into those large schools. I have the finance of the Board pretty well at my fingers' ends, and I am satisfied we can do it.

1096. *Mr. Luke.*] I should like to ask a question about the "outlandish" schools. Is it not possible to have a system of half-time schools in those places, where a male teacher could go round and devote, say, three days one week to one, and three days another week to another? I know it is a terrible thing to send young women to places of that kind?—I am afraid it would not answer.

1097. It is answering in other places?—I should much prefer to see the children taken to larger schools, where there would be better accommodation and teachers.

1098. Are there no means of conveying them?—Not unless the children are collected. We do take the children to school in one or two instances. It is a terrible state of things, and ought not to be tolerated for a moment.

1099. Are you in favour of a colonial scale of staffing and salaries if it is an equitable and fair scale?—I am not in favour of centralising anything if we can avoid it. I have yet to learn that anything is done better in Wellington than we can do it locally.

1100. *Mr. Hill.*] You suggest that special provision should be made for the small schools outside the ordinary £4 capitation grant?—I think so; there is no other way. I feel that in education districts like Nelson, Westland, and the Grey it is quite impossible for the Boards to carry on with a capitation of £4, because so many of the schools are so small.

1101. Would you not limit the places where you could establish schools of that kind—small schools, say, below 10 in average attendance?—I think I would draw the line perhaps at 12.

1102. Do you foster education in the country by getting the people to give grants towards the salaries of teachers?—We have only one such case here in Otago.

1103. Where help is given by the people?—I think so.

1104. As to the question of attendance, do you not think that the matter of a policeman coming in lowers the dignity of the schools?—I do not think so. I would make the constables truant officers, and give them permission to go to the school and ask the teacher to submit the daily roll to them, and they could see what children were absent, and take steps accordingly.

1105. Do you believe in paying upon the average attendance, or do you think the better plan would be to pay on the highest number present during the week?—I think the latter is the fairest way, because the teacher is always there to do the work, and so I think that is the fairest way to do it.

1106. Of course, that would make a great deal of difference to the teachers?—Yes; but, as I say, they are always there to do their work, and it is not their fault that the children are not there.

1107. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you go so far as to say that if the colony is determined to carry on the scheme for free primary education the teachers should be paid their salaries irrespective of any capitation allowance?—I do not know how it could be done.

1108. That is to say, that every one should be paid according to his worth irrespective of, and without any regard to, any particular capitation grant?—I have not considered it from that standpoint. I should not like to commit myself to a statement unless I had considered the matter.

1109. The question only arises when we come to consider whether £4 would meet all requirements and give adequate salaries. If the £4 would not be sufficient, would you be satisfied if we made the most of the £4 and disregarded the teachers?—That is to say, the teachers to get the same salary guaranteed them.

1110. Do you think, in the event of the £4 being insufficient, the colony should make up an amount equal to a proper wage?—That is what I mean.

1111. *Plus* expenses?—Yes.

1112. That if the colony be determined to pursue the present method of education the teachers should be paid fair salaries?—I should like to see every teacher in the colony with a salary as set forth in the schedule I placed before the Commission.

1113. What in your opinion should be the minimum wage for teachers, male and female?—I think £100 is surely about low enough.

Mr. Weston: Your experience in placing young women in the out-districts affects me as it does you. We in North Canterbury are very largely affected in the same way, and there are often very piteous cases, particularly those of girls.

1114. *The Chairman.*] You say you are not in favour of a colonial scale of salaries and staffing?—No.

1115. You do not believe in centralisation?—No, I do not.

1116. How has your Board, during the time you have been connected with it, got along with teachers? Do you think they are fairly satisfied?—I am very pleased to say we have had very few complaints. Of course, there is a little trouble now and again; but as a rule we have got on very well, and have had no trouble with them.

1117. And you do not wish to relinquish the power of the purse?—No, or I should say we should lose control, and I think the Boards do their work well.

1118. You believe you would be able to get along satisfactorily if you had only a £4 capitation, and paid every one adequately?—I am quite satisfied of that.

1118. You think that the districts that happen to be in an unfortunate position in having many small schools without any of the larger schools should have a differential capitation?—Special consideration should be shown to them.

1120. Do you think that would meet the difficulty?—I think it would.

1121. Do you think that teachers should be paid uniformly throughout New Zealand? I see no reason why they should not.

1122. But you prefer to have them under the control of the respective Boards?—Yes; and whenever the Board loses control of the purse it loses control altogether.

1123. In that event there could be no such thing as the carrying-on of various experiments with regard to the most economical and the most effective methods of working the national education system. Each district now has its own method?—We have always had to cut our coat according to the cloth allowed.

1124. When colonial staffing and salaries are introduced what do you think will follow?—I think the Boards will be obliterated. I think there is no doubt about that.

1125. Then the appointment of teachers will be vested in the central department?—Yes. I told the Otago Teachers' Institute that when a colonial scheme was brought in they would find a levelling-down so far as Otago was concerned; and you see how true my words were, looking at the proposed colonial scale.

1126. You do not approve of political patronage being largely extended?—Not a bit.

1127. And you think the teachers are safer in the hands of the Board than in the hands of a central department?—Much safer, if they did but know it.

1128. With regard to the irregular attendance, your method would be to correct that by altering the Act so as to make it compulsory for the children to attend eight times out of ten?—And the truancy clauses should be altered so as to be more workable.

1129. How do you think it would answer if the parents of absentees—that is, the real defaulters—were made liable for the loss to the teachers—I do not say necessarily sue them, but make them liable to be sued and to have the money recovered?—If you could sheet that home I think it would be very effective.

A. DAVIDSON examined.

Mr. Davidson: So many teachers have taken up parts of the subject that I intended to deal with that it would be almost superfluous for me to say much on the class of schools I represent. Still, I have one or two points I will bring before the Commission. The committee of the Dunedin branch of the Institute asked me to give evidence on behalf of the small country-school teachers—the head male teachers. The teachers of small country schools agree very much with what Mr. Inspector Goyen has already said, but I should like to emphasize the point that has been very strongly commented upon by the Inspector of the inconvenience and disabilities the teachers of the country schools have to suffer. I do not think that in any part of Otago, or of New Zealand, hours of labour included, you could get a stronger case than my own, because I think, of all the schools in Otago, the one I teach is situated in about the worst position. I think the Inspector of the Board will bear me out when I say that the children cannot even get home from school unless they trespass upon private property and go through barbed-wire fences. There is not a single road to the school over which the children can come unless they walk through quagmires of mud, and in the school it is of common occurrence to see a row of boots and stockings in front of the fireplace getting partially dried. No wonder that some of them are ill. I myself cannot get to my school without trespassing on private property. Perhaps this is all irrelevant, and might be more appropriately addressed to the Board than to the Commission; but it is an argument in favour of Mr. Goyen's contention that the teachers who take up country schools in such positions deserve to be remunerated for the inconveniences they suffer. These facts can be verified on any morning, and some idea can be obtained of what we have to contend with. When we get to school we do not feel much inclined to teach, for we have often mud up to the knees, and are wet through.

1130. *Mr. Weston.*] May I ask where this gentleman's school is?—About twelve or thirteen miles from here—at Lower Harbour—and I think it will compare in difficulties with any of the outlying district schools in Marlborough, or Westland, or any province. I am not exaggerating in the slightest; the Inspectors will bear out everything I have already said. Perhaps you may ask why I took the position. Well, I bought the proverbial pig in a poke. I applied for the position without seeing where the school was, and if there are many teachers placed in similar positions they will require substantial increases to induce them to remain in the country. I will now deal with the staffing of the schools. There is one thing about the staffing I do not like, and that is staffing on the average attendance, especially in the small country schools. An average attendance of 40 really means teaching not 40 children, but sometimes 48 and even 50. The average attendance fell sometimes to nearly one-half, very seldom below the half, and, of course, that affects the pay as well. I have taught a school of from 28 to 52. In my present school we have a roll-number of 52, and last quarter's attendance was 44. I find it a very hard school to work—in fact, one of the hardest. The average attendance is 44, but that does not indicate the number of children I have to teach. I am regularly teaching every week from 48 to 52. If we have a spell of fine weather in the winter I am teaching that number, but owing to a few wet days there is a falling-off that brings the average attendance down to 43 or 44. There is one fact that has not been touched upon by any of the teachers so far. They have answered questions as to the class of schools I am teaching, and they have said that they are able to teach a school of from 45 to 50 of an average attendance without any assistance. Now, I ask any country-school teachers in any of these small country schools, do they really teach the schools without assistance? Not one of them. Every one employs, and the Inspectors strongly recommend that we should employ, monitors all through the school, so that we are actually using assistance every day of the week, and the reason we use monitors is that we find our work so difficult. We are entitled to a mistress, at any rate, on an average attendance of 44 or 45. There is another point, as to computing the scale of salaries, that I would advocate. It is the principle suggested by Inspector Goyen. It is very seldom the attendance does fall below the half, but it is common to fall to nearly the half, and I think the working-average should be computed on a two-thirds basis. I am strongly in favour of that, which has been recommended by the Inspector, and for this reason: The teacher must do his work, it does not matter how many or how few there are present. If the Inspector comes when there is only half an attendance he does not expect to see us sitting half the day idle. I ask, is it fair, when we have to do the work, that we should suffer a reduction of salary on account of circumstances over which we have no control. The Otago Board allows a mistress at 51; the Institute recommended one should be allowed at 45 or 46. I am content to work a school of that class; but I believe it would be an advantage to some schools to introduce a mistress at a lower average, especially where the infant

department is a very large one. When the infant departments are half or more than half the school it would be very beneficial to introduce a mistress at 45, and in that case the teacher could get through the work without monitors. Suppose a parent should say you are not to use my child to teach somebody else's child, but are to teach him during school-time; if that is done we are thrown upon our own resources, and then the infant department must suffer to a very large extent. One more thing on this subject. I am opposed to Mr. White's idea of introducing relieving pupil-teachers or students. I do not think we should introduce pupil-teachers or students into these positions. If there is to be assistance, let it be that of a mistress, especially where sewing is required. I think that was Mr. White's own opinion, and not the opinion of the Institute. On the salary question I think, with Mr. Goyen, that £160 is not sufficient remuneration, and that it will not induce the best teachers to remain for any length of time in country schools. Would any of the town teachers like to exchange places with me at £160? Let them come and look at it, and I think they will not. We country teachers want to know if a colonial scale will give stability to the salaries. We complain of fluctuations. Take my own case, and I understand there are plenty like it: I took a position at a salary of £160. I did not growl about the salary, but I had not been teaching two years when, owing to the falling-off in attendance, the salary went down to £85 a year. Is that principle a right one? I gave up a position of about £140 to take the present one at £160, and, as I told you, I bought a pig in a poke. If I had known where it was I would not have taken it. That simply bears out Mr. Smeaton's remark that we are not sufficiently qualified from a business point of view to undertake anything outside teaching. I am pleased to say that since then my salary has risen again to £160; but what guarantee have we that the same thing will not occur under the colonial scale? With regard to the minimum classification under 35, I think the D2 is too high. I think that any number of teachers in Otago with D3, and even D4, are capable of teaching these schools.

1131. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Is it a fact that when teachers get into the back districts they never have a chance of working up?—They can work to a certain point, but no higher.

1132. To what point?—I myself have worked to D2. I believe I shall not be able to get D1 without experience in teaching in large schools.

1133. *Mr. Davidson.*] You object to the sudden drop in the salary of the country-school teacher under the present Otago scale—that is to say, if a teacher has an average attendance of 31 he receives £140 a year; if it drops under that, his salary falls to £100?—Yes, I think that is a very serious mistake in the drawing-up of the scale.

1134. Do you notice that in the suggested scale such a thing as that could not possibly take place?—Yes.

1135. The increase is per unit: which system do you favour?—The one that does not reduce the salary.

1136. The gradation by unit rather than the gradation by grade?—Yes.

1137. Now, in the event of kindergarten methods and manual training being introduced into the schools, do you think you could do the work equally well and satisfactorily?—No.

1138. Do you think the granting of an assistant at 40 would make the staffing of the school too liberal?—Well, there is the question of salary.

1139. Apart altogether from the question of salary, do you think the assistance of a mistress at 40 would be in the interests of the children?—Certainly it would be in the interests of the children if there were three or four teachers.

1140. If the colony can afford to pay salaries equal to those in Otago at the present time, you would then be in favour of the staffing suggested here?—Yes, I would.

1141. *Mr. Smith.*] Is there a house attached to the school?—Yes.

1142. I see it is valued at £35?—I would not give that for it.

1143. Is that deducted from the £160?—No; the salary has since gone up.

1144. Has the scale been altered?—No; the average of the school has risen.

1145. *Mr. Weston.*] Are you satisfied with your present salary?—No, I am not.

1146. What do you think you ought to get at the present time?—I think any one in my school, suffering under the conditions in which I am placed, is entitled to a salary of £180.

1147. And the house?—Well, as Mr. Goyen remarked, it is a place to live in. It was examined by the Board's Inspector the other day, and commented on adversely.

1148. What is your average attendance?—44, and there are 52 on the roll.

1149. *The Chairman.*] How long have you been teaching?—Between nine and ten years.

1150. How did your average become so low?—I cannot account for it, I am sure. I think most of the families had outgrown the school-age, and it took a year or two for the school to recover.

1151. You say your salary fell from £160 to £80?—Yes.

1152. Do you think a teacher ought to be paid upon the average attendance when it is subject to such fluctuations as that?—No, I do not think he should be paid strictly on the average attendance.

1153. Do you know of any other profession or line of life in which men are liable to reductions of that nature?—No, I do not.

W. S. Fitzgerald examined.

Mr. Fitzgerald: I shall not detain you long, but I have just been noting one or two points of some importance that have been omitted, or possibly points upon which stress has not been laid. I think five or ten minutes will suffice. The first point, which is of considerable importance, is that specific payment should be made for specific work, such as for the tuition of pupil-teachers. I think that separate payment should be made to the headmaster for his tuition. Reasons have already been given for that. I have been very much interested in pupil-teacher work, and I may tell you

that I have missed something that in past time I felt bound to commend, and I have missed it since the change in our system of payment. We have a number of pupil-teachers who attend the University, but the fees at the University are rather heavy—that is, heavy for pupil-teachers to pay out of the salary they receive. They may amount to four, or to seven, or to ten guineas. Now, sir, the lump sum paid to the headmaster as salary includes payment for the tuition of his pupil-teachers; but these pupil-teachers are not taught by the headmasters; they receive their tuition almost entirely at the University, and there is no deduction made from the headmaster's salary. I remember some cases in the past in which the headmaster when he received the payment for tuition would say, "Now, my boy, I have this money for teaching you; you have paid fees to the University; there is so-much for you to help you with your fees." They recognised the justice of it, and I think it is simple justice that this payment of university fees should be made in such cases. We had last year some fourteen city and suburban pupil-teachers attending the University, and this payment would have been a boon to many, and no injustice to the headmasters. We have heard it said that the headmaster gives tuition in the art of teaching, and therefore he is entitled to the payment; but as headmaster he should give tuition in the art of teaching not only to the pupil-teachers, but to every one of his assistants. That is his duty, and in this respect he has no special duty to the pupil-teacher. The pupil-teacher may require more tuition, but it is only a question of degree, and I do not consider the headmaster is entitled to any payment for that tuition in the art of teaching. It pays him by-and-by, as the teacher progresses in the school. The next point, Mr. Chairman, is that our pupil-teachers are well worthy the money they receive for their work, and they are worthy of a little more. If you consider the work which some pupil-teachers do, the classes which they manage, and the capitation which comes to the Education Board because of these classes, you will find that, after paying the pupil-teachers, there is a considerable surplus. I should like that attended to in connection with their training. There ought to be a liberal allowance made to training-colleges on behalf of pupil-teachers who have done four years' service in the schools. That will pay the country. Much has been said to you about the work of the pupil-teachers in the schools, and I am afraid a wrong impression has been made with regard to the work of our Otago pupil-teachers. It has been said their work is mechanical work. It would be a mistake to regard them as simply spending their time in marking exercises first in this class and then in that class. That is not the kind of mechanical work that, for instance, Mr. Goyen referred to; not work of that purely mechanical nature. In the first place, the first-class pupil-teachers are frequently put in charge of a standard—the First Standard, or even the Second. That is our highest class of pupil-teacher. Our second highest class of pupil-teacher may, with the consent of the Inspectors, be put in charge of a standard, and that is sometimes done. When I am going through the schools I find pupil-teachers do such mechanical work as this: The teacher has given a lesson in reading to the whole class, with the pupil-teacher looking on. His class is then divided into two sections—the greater portion of the class being composed of the better scholars, the smaller portion being the inferior scholars. Now, the pupil-teacher is expected to continue this lesson with the better portion of the class, while the teacher takes up the inferior division. That is, after a fashion, mechanical work; but it is good practice, and our pupil-teachers profit by it. And not only in reading but in other subjects we see such work done. If such work were not done you could not have the pupil-teachers making the appearance in the training-college that Mr. White said they did, and you could not have our young teachers making such appearance in some of the other education districts as we have heard members of this Commission acknowledge that they are doing. They are doing better than mere mechanical work. There is mechanical work that they should do, work that I object to the certificated master in charge of the class doing, for I do not think he is spending his time to the best advantage when he is, for instance, giving out dictation, or even marking dictation exercises, or doing such work as that. He has to see the exercises; he may not see them all, but the pupils know they are liable at any time to have their exercises looked over by the headmaster: he must surely see the composition exercises from beginning to end, and possibly the grammar exercises, but to such mechanical work as the first mentioned he should not give much of his time. Then, again, the pupil-teacher is engaged with him at writing exercises, helping him in the supervision, and there are other exercises he helps him to supervise. I hope you will not go away with the impression that in Otago the pupil-teachers spend their time in going from room to room simply marking exercises; such is not the case. There is one point in which I am specially interested, and I have felt it very keenly just recently, and that is in connection with the appointment of relieving-teachers. This is our system, and I believe it to obtain elsewhere: A school is not entitled to an additional assistant until it has had a certain average for two quarters in succession. Now, I was in a school recently—I believe I called the attention of some of the Commissioners to the condition of this school, and said distinctly before entering it, "This school I consider understaffed." Now, this was the condition with regard to the average attendance. For the first three or four weeks of one quarter the attendance was very low, but during the remaining weeks the attendance was up to the average which would have entitled the school to an additional teacher, but for the quarter it was not up to the average; so under the regulations it had no consideration. Next quarter it had the necessary average. It is now nearly at the end of the third quarter, and has still the average attendance entitling it to either two pupil-teachers or an additional assistant, but it has not got them. Now, for nearly three quarters that school has been earning the necessary capitation-money, and its teachers have been struggling with a greater number of children than the regulations acknowledge they should have, but it has not had even a relieving-teacher. Now we think a relieving-teacher should be given earlier than that, and this is what we mean by asking for a temporary teacher to a growing school. It may very well be done. It is perfectly safe: the school is earning the money, the teacher is only temporary, and if at the end of the quarter the returns show that the school is not entitled to a permanent teacher the temporary teacher may be withdrawn, and appointed to

some other school requiring his services. When I was rector of the training-college I frequently sent out students in their second year to fill such appointments, and when they came back I found they had greatly benefited by the practice they obtained. They had felt their deficiencies, and they had gauged their power. Most of them came back ready to learn more from the remaining part of their course than they would otherwise have done. You will notice, from everything that has been said by Mr. Goyen, on behalf of the Inspectors, that our sympathies are with the country teachers. Our sympathies are with the teachers as a body, but our sympathies are strongly with the country teachers, and you will see in our annual report that we advocated as strongly as possible that more consideration should be paid to the country teachers in this respect. I mention it because one or two witnesses have given evidence against it—that when a teacher is capable of giving instruction in secondary subjects, and has pupils ready to receive instruction in those subjects, he should be encouraged to give it. In our little country schools the teacher frequently gives such tuition, but he receives no consideration for it. Now, our present Government has been remarkably liberal in connection with education. We must acknowledge that, and we hope the liberality will go still further. It has been liberal, for instance, with regard to the district high schools. It has granted large capitation-money for every pupil attending those schools. We do not ask for that capitation-money for our small country schools, but for a little consideration for each pupil who is efficiently taught even one subject. That will be a great encouragement to our country teachers in the far-off districts. They are doing the work now, and they enjoy doing it; but we consider they should be paid for it. There is another resulting benefit that we have noticed. Since our Board adopted its Seventh Standard syllabus, we have noticed an important secondary result of its operation—viz., its tendency to lengthen the school-attendance. The presence of Seventh Standard pupils in the school encourages the Sixth Standard to remain, and the presence of Sixth Standard encourages the Fifth to remain. You have received evidence with regard to what is done in another colony in conveying remote pupils to a central school instead of establishing small schools. Well, we do that here, and I should just like to give you the result of our experience. I may take, for instance, Tapanui: There is a bush district within, say, eight miles of Tapanui, and a considerable number of children are conveyed from that district to the Tapanui School. There is a small farm district on the other side, and a number of children are conveyed from that district to the Tapanui School. Were that not done we should have to build two new schoolrooms and teachers' houses, pay for two teachers, and make an allowance to two Committees. Now the Board does not require to do that. I have seen the children on the road in nicely covered conveyances, going home from school as jolly as possible, and, I have no doubt, ready to do whatever work was waiting for them when they got home from school. And what does it cost us? The conveyance of pupils of two small schools costs the Board not more than £80 a year, if it reaches that sum. There is money saved, the attendance of these children is regular, the big school is benefited, and the children are benefited. When examining the central school it was also my duty to inquire into a petition from parents in another outlying district, asking for a school that would serve both their own and a neighbouring district. The people in the latter district were afraid I should recommend a school there, and that the conveyance of their children would cease, and they protested against it. They said, "We are satisfied with this arrangement; our children are benefited, and we do not want it changed." The experiment is a success, and I think it might be tried in many other districts; it would help to prevent the establishment of a large number of these small schools.

1154. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you of opinion that the Otago schools are now adequately staffed?—I think that some of our schools would be improved in efficiency by additions to their staffs.

1155. Do you consider the amended scale will remove the defects in the staffing of the Otago schools as at present provided?—So far as I have gone through that scheme, I think it will go far towards that.

1156. What do you consider the principal advantages of a colonial scale of staffing and salaries?—The Commissioner is, Mr. Chairman, to a certain extent begging the question. I am not opposed to a colonial scale, especially after the information we have received from the Inspector-General. There are benefits, however, apart altogether from that. There is doubtless a great deal of dissatisfaction in some districts, and if without producing dissatisfaction in the districts where there is satisfaction such a scheme can be introduced, that alone will be of immense benefit. If those dissatisfied districts are satisfied, the teachers will do their work with much greater efficiency. There is nothing like dissatisfaction for preventing good work in a school. It will tell all the day long, and all the week long, and all the year long; and, if removed, its removal alone would be a great benefit. There is, however, more than that. I think that raising the rate of remuneration in those districts will tend to raise the condition of education throughout the whole colony. That should be the tendency. I cannot say what is the condition of efficiency in their schools, but I think the higher the salary the greater will be the efficiency of the teachers who come into the service. We find in many services that efficiency depends largely upon the rate of pay, and it is specially so in connection with education. There is another thing: there no doubt exists a certain condition of unrest with regard to the rates of salaries. If you can remove that unrest by your colonial scale it will be a benefit to education in our colony. There are these and possibly many other advantages which may result from the adoption of an adequate colonial scale of remuneration for our teachers, and the adoption of an adequate scale of staffing for our schools.

1157. I understand you are in favour of a system of conveyance, and that you have partially tried it?—Yes.

1158. Are you aware that in 1899 the Victorian Education Department made a saving of £15,000 by that?—I am not aware of it, but I can quite credit it from our little experiment here.

1159. Do you know that the system finds favour amongst the sparsely populated districts of Victoria?—No, but I have already noticed that it finds favour amongst us.

1160. *Mr. Hill.*] Are you in favour of the centralisation of Inspectors?—This we have fought out already, and it is known what my opinion is.

1161. *Mr. Hogben.*] With regard to the first point touched upon—the payment of pupil-teachers—supposing that in a school where two pupil-teachers were granted under the colonial scale they were allowed the option of substituting one assistant for the two pupil-teachers, would not that lessen the remuneration to the headmaster?—Yes, it would deprive him of his tuition fee; but we have had applications from headmasters to do that same thing. They have been convinced that it would be in many cases for the good of the school, and we are convinced that in very many cases it is greatly for the benefit of the school that it should be done. I could tell you, on the other side, of one school that has been placed at a disadvantage by it; but that is an exceptional case.

1162. I can quite understand a headmaster, if he felt it would be for the benefit of the school, giving such advice, even if it took something off his salary; but do you think it is quite fair that we should call upon him to make a martyr of himself even to that extent?—It would deprive him of £15 under our scale. Well, I do not think we would force it upon him. That is, it lies with the Inspectors to recommend it, but it is very likely before we made such a recommendation we should consult with the headmaster.

1163. But, still, is it not fair to make it and improve the school?—Yes, I think it is. The school children should be considered in the first place; the teachers afterwards.

1164. Then, would it be fair to impose upon headmasters the consideration that their salaries were likely to be impaired, at the same time that they were asked to give their advice as to whether a course should be adopted which would result in a lowering of their salaries?—I think it is quite fair, especially if it is a matter of regulations. When the headmaster takes an appointment he takes it subject to the regulations.

1165. Take another point: you say a great many of your pupil-teachers are quite capable of taking work in connection with the university classes?—Yes.

1166. Would you in such a case pay the headmaster fees for tuition which he does not give, but which they receive at the university classes?—No, I do not think I should, especially if I could hand it to the pupil-teacher, so that he might use it to pay his university fees.

1167. You would give it to the pupil-teacher?—Yes; I do not wish to save it to the department.

1168. I am not proposing that the department should take up these duties; the department has enough to do already, working into the small hours of the night sometimes: but, looking at it quite on the basis of its own merits, do you think you would deduct from the headmaster's salary the amount that would be paid for the tuition of the pupil-teachers when the pupil-teacher goes to the university classes?—I should be quite prepared to do so.

1169. You are aware, of course, that the natural adviser of the pupil-teacher in the course of his studies would be the headmaster, would it not?—No. I am speaking for our own Board. To a certain extent the Board is the adviser of the pupil-teachers. In their regulations they distinctly provide for this, and that provision is advice in an indirect way, and a notice to them that they are quite at liberty to avail themselves of the privilege.

1170. Can you tell us the nature of the provision?—Yes. The provision is that if a pupil-teacher furnishes evidence such as the matriculation pass of the New Zealand University, and proceeds to the University, exemption from the course of studies prescribed by the Board shall, upon application, be granted on the following conditions: That he take the arithmetic course prescribed by the Board, &c.; that he declare his intention to become a teacher in the public schools of the colony; and that he obtain the Board's approval of the number of classes to be taken by him in one session. The last is intended to prevent him from overtaxing his powers, and is an important provision. It is quite possible for a pupil-teacher to do so much university work in the evening as not to be quite fit for his duty next morning, so he submits to the Board the classes he intends to take, and he is restricted to these. I think I may just say that I am not in sympathy with the remark one witness made, that our young men shirk the pupil-teachers' course of study. I do not think that is one of the reasons we have so few young men entering the service.

1171. One point as to that. Application has to be made by the candidate before he goes to the university classes. Would not the headmaster be the one to advise him to make that application—I mean in the position of a friend?—I think the pupil-teacher should take the advice of the headmaster. It was not done previously, but this year notice has been given that these applications must come through the headmaster.

1172. But in any case it is natural the headmaster should advise?—Decidedly; but I do not think the headmaster should have the power of preventing the pupil-teacher availing himself of the university classes.

1173. No; but to a certain extent the headmaster would be in the position of advising the pupil-teacher to take a course that would lessen his own salary?—Quite so.

1174. Do you think that is quite fair?—I think it is. I may say, notwithstanding what has been said here about salaries, I do not think we have a single headmaster in the service of the Board but would give to the pupil-teacher, under such circumstances, the advice to go to the University.

1175. I quite believe that. I have been a teacher myself long enough to believe it. Still, I do not think, for all that, that it is made quite clear to me that it is quite fair. Now, apart from all money considerations, do you not consider that when a teacher is in charge of a large class, say, of 80 pupils belonging to one standard, it would be a help if he had a pupil-teacher associated with him?—I certainly think it would be a very great help to him.

1176. Would it not relieve him not only from the more mechanical work in the narrow sense, such as the mere correction of exercises, but from the more mechanical part of class-instruction?—I think it would, especially in the direction I indicated while I was speaking.

1177. In that case it would set the teacher of the class free to do a larger portion of the work which can only be done by a matured mind?—That is so.

1178. So that it would be a distinct advantage to him to have a capable pupil-teacher?—That is so. I may say, in illustration of that, that I recently visited a school and found two large classes of the size you indicate. The teachers were working without assistance, and I at once went to the headmaster and pointed out to him the absolute necessity for these teachers receiving the assistance of pupil-teachers. He acknowledged it, but said, "I am hard pressed." I said, "Yes, but with this state of things in your school I cannot approve of your organization. Will you give each of these teachers a pupil-teacher?" "Certainly"; and he gave them.

1179. You think, whether it was the fault of the master or of the system, the organization that did not permit of such assistance being given would be open to criticism?—Certainly. I acknowledged that the headmaster was hard pressed.

1180. Then, again, taking the average teacher—of course, with adequate salaries to induce teachers of good quality—what do you think, in the interests of the children, is the largest average class the teachers should take?—We have considered that very carefully, and our opinion is that 60 in average attendance, especially in the upper parts of the schools, is quite sufficient. You may possibly have heard evidence to-day that may seem in conflict with that, but a great deal of this depends upon what is the teacher's estimate of his work—that is to say, whether or not his estimate of his work includes making a child observant and thoughtful, and, in addition to giving him a certain amount of information, making the operation of his mental faculties accurate and prompt. I think, perhaps, that may be done with larger classes; but there is another side to the teacher's work, and that other side requires individual knowledge of every child in the class, and demands intelligent sympathy with every child in the class. That is the work that results in the formation of good character. I do not think that the man who has an average attendance of more than 60 in his class can be capable of discriminating between them so as to engage successfully in the work of moulding character.

1181. There is one point more upon which I should like your opinion. With regard to the colonial scale, I suppose the maintenance of any scale ultimately depends upon public opinion—that it is in any case the public opinion of the constituencies that determines the scale?—That is so.

1182. Would not a scale that was dependent upon the public opinion of the whole colony, which embraces the constituencies that elect the House of Representatives, be therefore more likely to be stable than that which embraced only a small portion of the colony?—I am not quite clear on that. We have two bodies determining the scales. We have our Board, dependent for its existence upon the School Committees, and these School Committees may be very largely influenced by the teachers. Committees may bring their influence to bear on the Boards, just as constituents may bring their influence to bear upon members of Parliament. I am not quite clear as to which is preferable on that ground, but I deprecate giving our teachers any temptation to cast themselves into party politics, and that would possibly happen. Let them do their duty as citizens certainly, but I do not think they should take an active part either in elections or in disputed political questions. There is another point which I think should be noted, and it is a point of considerable importance in connection with country teachers. Mr. Mackenzie suggested the thing to me. It is this, and I should like the Commissioners just to note it: When I was in the training-college, I frequently had my students attending the University, say, for a year, and then, for want of means, they were compelled to leave, and to take up country schools. They had had a year at the University; I was anxious they should go on with their studies; they had a D certificate; I wanted to see them go up for a C, but I found that pressure of work in the schools frequently compelled them to relinquish preparation for this examination. If they were admitted to the C certificate examination on the same principle as to the D and E—that is to say, they might take it in sections and a partial pass be granted—it would be an immense improvement to the condition of our country teachers, and perhaps lead those who would otherwise seek to remain in town, for the sake of classification, to go to the country, and to give their attention first to one subject and then to another, instead of having to keep up all the subjects necessary for the C examination. This would not lessen their status as teachers, and possibly their scholarship would be improved by it, for certainly, with the attention confined to one subject, they could go more deeply into it. It would have this good effect on the schools: we should have in them minds that were living, that were growing, and that is what we want—men who are mentally alive. To study under a teacher whose mind is dead is like drinking out of a stagnant pool; to study under one whose mind is alive is like drinking from the living fountain. Now we want our teachers alive. It was only a figure of speech used by the secretary when he spoke about the teacher's horse standing saddled outside the school, but I want the saddle taken off, and the horse put into a paddock.

1183. *The Chairman.*] Into a paddock where there is plenty of grass, of course?—Yes; let there be grass in the paddock in connection with all our schools, so that far-away children may come riding to the school—one, two, or three on a horse's back—and then turn the horse into that paddock, even though the teacher's horse may go short. If you could introduce the principle of examination for the C certificate in one subject at a time if desired, I think you would confer a great boon upon our country teachers.

1184. You say you would like to see the teachers a little more alive, and I think they might be made a little less dependent: do you believe in the present system of promoting and appointing teachers?—Well, I believe the Education Board, with all the information at its disposal, is better capable of selecting the men most fitted for an appointment than the local Committee is. Personally, I am not anxious to have that brought about; I am not anxious to have the responsibility thrown upon me, and I recognise that in that case, of course, the responsibility would largely rest on the Inspectors; but, as you ask the question, I give you candidly my opinion.

1185. It has been said that if you reduce the power exercised by the School Committee in connection with the appointment of teachers you virtually place them in a somewhat humiliating position; that they will have little to do beyond looking after the cleaning and repairing of the schools. Now, do you not think that if the Committees were confined chiefly to reporting with reference to the conduct and capabilities of a teacher—and when they have faults to find, reporting those faults to the Education Board—that that would give them a very large amount of power?—Yes, it would give them a very large amount of power; and I grant this also: that when the Board sends down the name of a teacher to a Committee the Committee might have the privilege of giving reasons why they should not accept that teacher. I think that would tend still more to retain their interest in the school.

1186. You have made use of the term "unrest" amongst the members of the profession with reference to their salaries: do you know of any profession or calling in which there is as much variation of payment as in the teaching profession?—Yes, there are such; but then this element of unrest does not tell so much, for instance, upon the work of a bricklayer. Though he is not sure of the rate of next week's pay, he can lay bricks just as efficiently and skilfully as he could do if he had no doubt about it. But it is different with the teacher's work; it demands his undivided attention; and this unrest, if it does not destroy his work, is very injurious to it.

1187. I want to know whether that unrest is not chiefly due to the fact that the teacher has no guarantee that he will be promoted according to his merits—that promotion depends entirely on the amount of canvassing he may have done amongst Committees from time to time?—I must acknowledge the existence of the evil. The necessity for canvassing is a great evil, and that is another cause of unrest to the teacher. If that canvassing could be stopped it would be of immense benefit to everybody concerned, even to the members of the Committees themselves.

1188. Do you think, if the promotion and appointment of teachers were taken out of the hands of the Committees and of the Boards and vested in a central department, that that would be of benefit to the teaching profession?—Well, I do not think that in New Zealand, situated as we are, a central department is yet in a position accurately to judge of the qualifications of teachers, and of the interests of special schools. I think the Education Boards can yet do that much more accurately and effectively than a central department.

1189. I presume the teachers are quite as safe, with reference to promotion and advancement, in the hands of the Board as they are likely to be in the hands of a political department?—Yes; but I hope the day will never come when the teachers will be in the hands of a political department.

P. Goyen, Inspector of Schools, recalled.

1190. *Mr. Weston.*] With respect to the tables you have placed before us [Exhibit 60], are the salaries on the first scale or the amended scale?—The figures in the second money column refer to the first scale. I might say that for the larger schools, at any rate, I prefer Mr. Hogben's first scheme so far as staffing is concerned. I make no reference to salaries, for I feel, with the teachers, that the salaries must not be allowed to sink; but, with regard to staffing, I say that that of the first scale is the better.

1191. *Mr. Hill.*] You recognise that the present staffing of the Otago Education Board has defects?—Certainly it has.

1192. I cannot yet make any comparison myself between the list you have presented of the Otago staffing and the official printed form that is issued by the Board. You have here, I see, for example, in a school of 590 seven assistants and two pupil-teachers. The official staffing, as we have it, unless I misread it, gives five assistants in such a school—that is, your Otago printed list gives five assistants, and the official salaries here do not correspond with those you have put down?—Under our regulations an assistant may take the place of two pupil-teachers.

1193. Is there any note of that?—No, but that is the case. You will find, on going through the tables, that the scales do not agree: the number of teachers does not agree with the scale. You will find the explanation of that in this circumstance: that in Otago an assistant frequently takes the place of two pupil-teachers.

1194. There is no regulation to that effect?—There is a resolution if not a regulation. Might I put it before the Commission in this way? The Otago staffing is intended to represent the staffing I found in the Otago schools recently inspected by me; it is a staffing allowed by the Otago Education Board. On the other side of the return is the staffing that would be allowed under the scheme proposed by Mr. Hogben.

1195. Then, you recognise this fully and completely: that the proposed staffing is much better than the staffing at present in operation in the Otago Education District?—Yes. What I want to say is that, whether the Otago staffing is or is not according to the regulations, it is the staffing I found in the schools, and that if that is not the staff to which the school is entitled, then the staff is greater than that to which the school is entitled; and if that is the case the argument is still stronger in favour of the colonial scheme. I wish the Commission to understand that in every case the numbers given on the left-hand side are the numbers of the staffing I found when I inspected the schools. These numbers are taken from my note-book.

D. R. White recalled.

Mr. White: I should like to remark that the members of the Commission must really be impressed with the opinion that Otago is the hub of the universe, since they have heard so much about it; and you have had the patience to listen to all things—and a few others. At the previous sitting I was asked for my opinion on the proposed minimum qualification for teachers. I approve of fixing B1 as the qualification for the headmastership of the largest schools. I hand in a document [Exhibit 61] which shows that there are a large number of teachers in the colony who have the necessary qualification. I make this statement not on behalf of the Institute, but as my own personal opinion.

INVERCARGILL.

WEDNESDAY, 22ND MAY, 1901.

JOHN COWIE, Chairman of the Southland Education Board, examined.

Mr. Cowie: The first and most important thing I would like to bring before the Commission is the fact that when any vacancy occurs in any of our schools we are flooded with applications from females, whilst there is a dearth of male applicants; and then the boys that do apply are not the brightest boys by any means. No scale will be satisfactory unless there is a considerable levelling-up. We require that there should be greater inducements for the best boys to go into the teaching profession. As it is, they will take up almost anything else before they will take up teaching. I do not know whether that is entirely owing to the low salaries that are paid, but you will notice that assistant masters in some of the middle-sized schools get from £100 to £130 a year. These men are married, and have to maintain families and pay house-rent. Taking all these things into consideration, their salary is a miserable pittance. A rabbiter can earn more than they can almost at that rate. We must have good men as our assistant teachers, and £130 even is a poor salary for a man who has a house to rent and everything to buy. With regard to the staffing, that is a little remedied on what was proposed in the first scheme by the second that has been brought down. I do not agree with the introduction of an assistant at 35 or 40. What would two adult teachers get to do in a school of that size, and where would there be opportunity for training pupil-teachers?

1. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] What remuneration do you think would be sufficient to induce bright lads to go into teaching?—I think that when an assistant teacher is able to take a school of 200 children he should be allowed house-rent over and above his salary—perhaps £40 or £50 a year more.

2. You think that a prospect of that sort would induce more lads to enter the profession?—I have no doubt about it.

3. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you noticed that the second proposed scale covers all the Southland schools except two?—No.

4. There are only two schools, I think, in Southland having an average attendance of over 330, so that the salary and staff allotted in this scale really deals with the whole of the schools of Southland except the two largest?—Yes.

5. Have you noticed the salary suggested to be allowed for the various grades of schools in the second proposal?—Yes. I think it is an improvement as far as it goes, but, as I stated, it does not state the salary for the assistant at all.

6. You heard the statement of the Inspector-General that the assistant would receive a salary as high as that paid in any part of the colony, and I think you are aware that the salary paid to the assistant in Southland is not the highest paid in New Zealand, and therefore it follows that the suggested scale is higher than that paid in Southland?—Just so.

7. *Mr. Stewart.*] Would it assist the finance of your Board to have the payment of your teachers fixed on this colonial basis, so as not to trench upon the remaining funds of the Board?—It would all depend upon our capitation.

8. You are aware that the capitation allowance will be increased by 5s., in order that all these charges may be met?—It requires more financial study than I have had opportunity of giving it.

9. *Mr. Luke.*] Are you in favour of a colonial scale if equitable and fair?—Yes.

10. *Mr. Hill.*] Are you also in favour of a colonial scheme of promotion for teachers?—I think that would work satisfactorily.

11. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] I see by your regulations that you make a grant of 3s. 6d. per head for School Committees' work: do you find that the School Committees keep the school and the grounds in fair order on that grant?—Yes. They grumble now and again, but they get up entertainments, and raise funds in that way to assist them.

12. *Mr. Weston.*] Is the assistance that Committees get by way of entertainments material in amount?—Sometimes it is as high as £20 in a district.

13. Can you estimate the total amount of subscriptions over the education district?—No, I cannot; but there are very few districts that do not supplement their revenue by entertainments of some sort.

14. You have a scale of allowances throughout your educational district for incidentals?—Yes.

15. Does the Board itself supplement the allowances prescribed by that scale?—No; they undertake repairs sometimes that the Committee should do, and give them half-cost in some cases.

16. *Mr. Hogben.*] I find that the expenses of your Board, independent of building, teachers' salaries and allowances, and items otherwise provided for, come to something like £4,330. Supposing the other expenses of the Board were fully met, it would not affect the finance of the Board if the salaries were paid according to the colonial scale, the money being forwarded to the Board to pay these salaries?—It would not affect the Board in the least.

17. If you got £400 or £500 more towards expenses it would rather tend to relieve the finance?—Yes.

18. You spoke of repairs, and the Committees asking for them to be done by the Board: are you aware that these repairs might be made out of the building grant of the Board?—Yes, I understand that.

19. Are they so met?—Partly; that is the vote from which we vote half-cost of repairs.

20. *The Chairman.*] You say you are in favour of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries?—Yes.

21. Do you wish the power of deciding upon the payment of teachers and staffing your schools taken out of the hands of the Education Board and vested in a State department?—Of course, that is another question altogether.

22. I take it for granted, then, that you do not wish to see the Boards deprived of the power which they have exercised ever since the Education Act was passed of determining the staffing of

the schools and the payment of teachers?—I do not object to a colonial scale of salaries, but would leave the staffing of the schools to the different Boards.

23. If the introduction of the colonial scale of salaries would have the effect of abolishing the system of payment by capitation, would you then be in favour of it?—No.

24. You want to see the system of payment to the Boards by capitation perpetuated?—Yes.

25. Then, if you were told that it would be absolutely impossible to introduce this colonial scale and at the same time maintain the schools as they are maintained now—by the capitation system—you would be opposed to it, would you not?—Yes.

26. Have you had any great difficulty in paying your teachers: has the Board drifted into a bad financial position in any way?—No. We have managed fairly well, but have had to exercise the greatest economy in getting both ends to meet.

27. Have you got along fairly well on £3 15s.?—We have been going to the bad for the last few years.

28. Has there been any falling-off in the average attendance of your schools?—Yes, for the last year or so.

29. Has it been due to that chiefly that the finances are not so healthy as they were previously?—Partly that; the revenue was not so large, and there was practically the same expenditure.

30. Do you think the 5s. additional capitation would put you in a fairly good financial position?—It would add a large sum to the revenue.

31. Would it be sufficient?—It would all depend on how much the salaries were increased.

32. Do the schools suffer in any way because there are so many more female applicants than there are males?—I am not prepared to say that.

33. When the vacancies are worth, say, £150 and upwards, do you have sufficient applications from male teachers?—We have always some. I was referring more to pupil-teachers than to assistants.

34. In order to induce more applications from males, what salaries do you think require to be levelled up?—Assistant masters in ordinary schools ought to be raised £50 a year.

35. What are they, generally, getting now?—£120 and £130.

36. Do you think that assistant teachers ought to receive house allowance?—Either that or larger salaries.

37. It has been found that the difficulty found in certain districts in New Zealand with regard to the payment of teachers might be met by instituting a differential capitation allowance: how do you think that would answer?—It would help those districts that have a large preponderance of small schools, such as the West Coast.

38. If the central department undertook the payment of teachers out of an annual vote passed by the Legislature, and apportioned a certain sum to each educational district for maintenance, to be distributed amongst the Committees, do you think that the schools would be supported by way of entertainments or public subscriptions, as you have mentioned is done here at present?—Perhaps not; the people may then come to look upon the Government as the father of the schools altogether, and lean upon it.

39. If the State takes over the payment of teachers, who, in your opinion, should make the appointments—the paymaster or the Board?—I should say, the Board.

40. Do you not think that under a colonial scale of salaries the Boards would give away their birthright at once?—No, I do not think they would. The Government, in a way, pay the teachers as it is.

41. Yes; but the Board works out the scheme. Are you willing to place yourself in the hands of the department with regard to the payment of salaries?—We are practically in the hands of the head of the department now in that respect.

42. You get capitation now: are you content to relinquish that and be dependent upon a certain sum voted every year by Parliament?—No.

43. You prefer to vote the money yourself rather than be spoon-fed?—Yes.

44. *Mr. Smith.*] Are you in favour of the Inspectors being placed under the central department?—No, I am not.

45. At present you receive £300 a year for inspection, and you spend £950, or thereabouts. If the Inspectors were paid by and under the control of the department you would save that: does that affect your position?—No.

JOHN NEILL, Secretary of the Southland Education Board, examined.

Mr. Neill: I probably do not represent the opinions of my Board as a whole, but I know I represent the opinions of some of them, at any rate; and I may say that this Education Board, in the year 1888, propounded a scheme to the Government showing how a differential capitation grant would meet the difficulty that the Commission is now inquiring into. At the time Mr. T. M. McDonald, the Crown Prosecutor at Invercargill, was Chairman of the Board we submitted a scheme for the payment of differential capitation on the quarterly attendance at the schools. That scheme was that the grant should be on a sliding-scale—being largest in the smallest schools, and decreasing as the attendance increased. I would like to point out to the Commission how such a sliding-scale of capitation would affect not only this district, but all the districts in New Zealand. In this district we have only two large schools and 145 smaller ones. On the two larger schools we have a saving of £936 per annum. In the next grade that concerns this district—174 to 225—we have seven schools, and the average saving on each school is £112 a year, or a total of £784. The total saving on these two grades is £1,719. From this saving this Board has to pay the deficiencies that arise in the great majority of the other 138 schools. In Otago there are twenty-two large schools, and, calculating their profits on the same basis as those of Southland, the profits from the large

schools in Otago come to £6,260, out of which they have only to make up the deficiencies that might occur in the two hundred smaller schools remaining; whereas Southland has to maintain the deficiencies that occur in the 138 weak schools out of £1,719. You will therefore see the absolute injustice of expecting anything like uniformity of salaries when the accident of population in any one district so seriously handicaps the Board. The Otago Board, as you know, holds the premier position for the payment of salaries, but there is no virtue in that, because they have the money to do it with. Had the Southland or the Westland Board the money to do it with they would do it to-morrow, and do it cheerfully, I am sure. In other words, those districts which by the accident of population have large populous centres, and large schools in these centres, are in a position to pay better salaries than can ever be the case in another district where the population is less dense. Under a sliding-scale of capitation, which, I venture to say, any one acquainted with the figures of the Education Department could propound in a fortnight, the Boards could be put in the way of paying fair salaries. The proposal to allocate £250 per annum, *plus* 11s. 3d. per pupil, would not place this Board in such a good position as the Secretary of Education put it. I went into the figures last evening, and I agree with Mr. Hogben that the office-administration and other expenses to be borne out of this 11s. 3d. would approximately be what he states it to be. I am not, however, quite clear that we would not suffer very materially in having to administer the affairs of this district, apart from salaries, out of the £250 grant, *plus* 11s. 3d. per head of the school population. The average attendance of the schools in the Southland District is about 8,000. Taking that as a basis, we would get in all £4,750, and our average expenditure for the last two years has been £4,287 a year; and I may say that in that average expenditure is not included many things and many items that this district, in common with other educational districts in New Zealand, should enjoy. We have no art school and no art master, no gymnastic instructor and no gymnasiums. And even while our cost of administration is as low as any in New Zealand, it will go on increasing, and the Board has now under consideration the appointment of an assistant for the office. Then, again, the Board would not be in a much better position than now, for it must be remembered that three-fourths of the actual revenue of any educational district is ear-marked. I am not saying this in opposition to a colonial scale of salaries, which I would heartily welcome, but I say that under the present proposals Boards would not have the same elasticity in their finance as they have under the present system. To take an extra £100 or £200 out of an income of £32,000 is an easy matter, but to take it from an income of £4,750 is quite another thing, as you will all observe. I think the capitation should be increased to 12s. 6d. at least to enable the Boards to finance easily under a colonial scale of salaries. There is another feature of the payment of 11s. 3d. that does not commend itself to me, although the payment of the £250 in some measure does away with the objection. The payment of the 11s. 3d., made on the average attendance, is open to the same objection as if there was a capitation of £3 15s. In Otago, with 225 schools, the school population is more than double that of Southland with 147 schools. There, again, Otago, with the more populous centres, receives the advantage. Now, with regard to the colonial scale of salaries submitted by Mr. Hogben, I would like to make a few remarks on the proposals contained therein. In schools of 14 to 19 there appears to be no justification for the sudden increase of salary from the first to second grade of schools. If it could be arranged, I would like to see a gradual increase of salary on a fixed equitable scale of gradual steps from 14 up to 1,400, if need be. In the next class of schools I am entirely opposed to the deduction of £10 from the teacher's salary for the payment of the sewing-mistress. If a sewing-mistress is a necessity at a certain average in a school her salary should be provided independently. This deduction practically penalises the head-teacher for raising the attendance of his school by a few pupils. Even if the head-teacher's wife is to be the sewing-mistress, I think that the salary for her services should be an independent payment. Then, in the grades of schools from 100 to 250, the mistress, or first assistant female as she is styled here, is insufficiently paid. The duties of the mistress of these schools are both onerous and responsible. Moreover, the staffing of these schools is small in comparision with the high-grade school, and therefore the mistress has work to do, practically unaided, which in a larger school would be distributed over a number of females. I refer to the teaching of sewing, kindergarten, physical exercises, domestic economy, &c. Then, there is the very serious reduction compared with the present rates. For teachers receiving £110 to £115 at present, it is proposed to reduce to £90 to £105—a reduction of £10 per annum. In the last division of the same group of schools—175 to 250—the second assistant male, our present first assistant, would receive £80 to £100 as salary. These assistants are at present paid £130 to £140, and I consider them not by any means overpaid at that. Then, take the next group—570 to 660: In these classes of schools the first assistants in this district would be reduced £10 per annum, according to the first issued scale. Considering the fact that B2 classification is required, and that these assistants must be qualified to act in the absence of the headmaster, and that the tone of the higher division of the school depends in a large measure on their capacity and influence, the salary paid in Southland does not appear to me to be excessive. In the first division of the same class—570 to 600—the third male assistant, our present second assistant, would suffer a reduction from £197 to £120. In the group 260 to 600 the rise in salary for mistresses from £105 to £170 does not appear to have any justification in the nature of the duties to be performed, or any other consideration I am aware of. In our scale the extremes differ by £25, and in the proposed scale they differ by £65. The proposed scale, or a modification of it, would undoubtedly benefit the cause of education in the country districts, and also individual teachers in this district. The general tendency of the proposed scale is to encourage teachers to go to the country, and I think that that influence is good. The salaries proposed to be given to pupil-teachers are more liberal than the average, when the lodging-allowance is taken into account. In my judgment, male pupil-teachers will not be induced to enter the

service at the same rates of pay as females. At present only one-sixth of the applicants are males. During the last twelve months every possible male applicant has got an appointment if at all qualified. Our payment for male and female pupil-teachers greatly differs. Females begin at £22 10s., and males at £35; and females finish with a salary of £42 10s., as against £55 for males. There is a note upon the proposed colonial scale which says that a fifth-year pupil-teacher continuing in the same school shall receive the remuneration of a third-year pupil-teacher, but if transferred to another school he shall be paid as a fourth-year pupil-teacher. With the general tendency of that note I am in agreement. I have long felt that pupil-teachers should be offered some inducement to seek employment in country schools as assistants. It is a common thing for pupil-teachers to remain two or three years in the school after their apprenticeship is completed. Speaking with reference to females, it is quite a common thing for them to remain in a school in town as long as the Board will allow them, and if some such scheme of paying these teachers at a reduced rate after their apprenticeship was completed was introduced I think it would be a good thing. In the District of Otago the rule is that on the 31st December all the pupil-teachers in the service who have finished their apprenticeship walk out of the service. That is not so in Southland, and I believe the Southland system is the better one by a long way. We do not manufacture pupil-teachers for whom no employment afterwards can be found. Mr. Davidson reminds me that in Otago they walk out of the schools in which they have served their apprenticeship into the training-college. It is unfortunate for Southland that they have no training-college, and cannot under the existing state of things. In the staffing of schools from 35 to 75, in my judgment the appointment of a D4 assistant should be deferred till an average of 45 is reached. To most teachers of this class of schools the appointment of a fully qualified assistant at, say, an average of 35 to 45 would prove infinitely less welcome than a moderate increase in salary. I know that the worst class of school to work unaided is that from 45 to 50. The position of a teacher of a school of from 35 to 40 with an assistant to help him would be one of the easiest in the service. I think a moderate increase in salary would be the best thing, or even a moderate alteration in the syllabus. Another difficulty that presents itself in connection with schools of this class, of which there are ten to twenty in this district, is that it would be impossible for two certificated teachers to work amicably and comfortably in one room, and to introduce that part of the scheme in this district would mean the erection of ten or fifteen rooms. This would be a calamity, because there is plenty of accommodation now. I might say here that even at 45 something less than a D4 would be ample. I think a certificated teacher of any grade from E5 upwards, paid at the rate of £65 or £70 a year, would be sufficient. I recommend this because, in my judgment, there should be a stepping-stone between the pupil-teacher ranks and the fully qualified assistant teacher. In the scale there is no provision for relieving-teachers or sick-leave, and some such provision would have to be made. Generally speaking, here we have employed occasional relieving-teachers, because we had not £200 or £250 to set aside for a permanent relieving-teacher, who would always be in the service. Now with regard to School Committee allowances: In sending out to you a statement of the Board's expenditure an error crept into School Committees' allowances, and 2s. 6d. in that connection should read 3s. 6d. Payments here to School Committees are made on average attendance. For a school of 20 to 25 £10 is paid, and for all schools above that there is an additional 3s. 6d. per pupil of average attendance paid. This scale was introduced two years ago, with the result that it added to the Board's expenditure nearly, if not quite, £300 per annum. Had that alteration not been made, Mr. Hogben's figures with regard to the Board's administration would have had a great deal more meaning to us. In the opinion of some members of the Board it was a mistake to make that alteration. I had hoped that when that alteration was made School Committees might be expected to take more interest in their buildings, and effect the more necessary repairs that had previously been borne by the Board alone. The experience of the last two years has shown that if even a pane of glass is broken the School Committees are just as willing to ask the Board for money to replace as they were before. There has been no improvement in that connection. In respect to the working-out of the scale itself, no comparison can be made between this district and any other district in New Zealand, because the responsibility of the Committee is not defined. In Otago, if they wish to renovate the interior of the teacher's residence the Committee are asked to pay half the cost. Such a thing is not thought of in Southland. We keep them in repairs, unless they are very petty. In the matter of shelter-sheds, gravelling, asphalting, and works of that sort we rigidly adhere to the system of half-cost. That is one of the wisest things that exists in our regulations. It makes the Committees careful in the expenditure of the money they ask for. There is one feature of it, however, that does not commend itself to me. School Committees whose ordinary expenditure may be very small may save up the Board's capitation, which they receive from quarter to quarter, and then turn round and ask the Board for a subsidy to build a shelter-shed, and both their subsidy and the Board's subsidy come from the Board's pocket. That is not done in all cases, but it is done in some cases, I know. The payment of capitation to School Committees, whether large or small, depends on the responsibility thrown on Committees as to what they do with the money.

46. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you in favour of a national system of education in New Zealand?—Yes.

47. Do you think that, with thirteen different scales of staffing and thirteen different scales of salaries, we can really claim at the present time to have a national system of education in New Zealand?—I do not.

48. In your opinion, is the effect of having different scales of salaries this: that the best teachers naturally gravitate to the districts where the best salaries are paid?—Yes.

49. Therefore, unless we have a colonial scale of staffs and salaries the present condition of things will continue?—Yes, unless some modification is made.

50. It has been suggested as a way out of the difficulty that there should be a differentiation of capitation to the different districts, so as to satisfy the varying conditions. If you were to take

any grade of school as a basis—suppose you took schools having an average attendance of 50 and excluded all those below, or take schools up to 300—would not the varying conditions that now exist still exist to a large degree?—That would, of course, depend upon the individual Boards. What I said was that with a graduated scale of payment of capitation the Boards would be in a position to pay something like an average salary for the colony.

51. I find that the schools at present in the colony over 300 are as follows: Auckland, seventeen; Taranaki, two; Wanganui, five; Wellington, eleven; Hawke's Bay, three; Marlborough, none; Nelson, one; Greymouth, one; Westland, none; North Canterbury, thirteen; South Canterbury, four; Otago, sixteen; Southland, two. Now, under any scheme except a colonial scheme of staffing and salaries varying conditions would continue?—Possibly.

52. I think I understood you to say that the large schools helped to pay for the smaller ones? —Yes, undoubtedly.

53. Well, if Otago has sixteen schools of an average attendance of over 300, and Southland has only two such schools, under any system except a colonial scale of staffing and salaries Otago would be in an infinitely better position?—Yes, if a fixed capitation was paid. That has been the position for the last twenty years.

54. If a colonial scale could be devised that would give for the whole colony a scale of salary equal to that paid in Otago, would not that be in the interest of education throughout New Zealand?—Most undoubtedly. I have advocated a levelling-up process throughout. On the whole, I think that the teaching staff are miserably underpaid. I am very doubtful whether the 5s. capitation increase will be sufficient to bring all the salaries up to the Otago level.

55. You think that to have one scale instead of thirteen different scales would be entirely in the interests of the education of the colony?—Yes, entirely, inasmuch as it would be in the interests of the teachers of the colony.

56. *Mr. Stewart.*] Are you aware that the suggested scales laid on the table do not strictly base their calculation as to payment of teachers on average attendance?—I was not aware of that. I thought they were paid on average attendance.

57. But have you not noticed that the total amount payable to any Board for teachers' salaries would not represent an exact equivalent for the pupils on that Board's list?—Yes.

58. Practically that is differentiation of capitation arrived at by another method?—Yes.

59. Do you not think that differentiation on that principle would work out more equitably than the arbitrary differentiation per pupil paid over to the Board?—I think that to have differentiation of capitation the schools must be classified in groups, and a scale of staffs arranged in connection with these groups. Those who propounded the scheme would be in a position to draw up an equitable amount to pay *per capita* of each pupil in the particular grade of school. But I think that the best of all solutions of the difficulty is decidedly the colonial scale of staffs and salaries, although there is no getting away from the fact that it means that the individuality of the Boards will in some measure be sunk, and that unless liberal provision is made the Boards will not be able to finance so liberally as now.

60. Supposing that such a liberal scale were resolved upon for your Board, do you think that every objection to a colonial scale of staffs and salaries would be removed?—Yes, I do.

61. Have you any reservation on the point whatever?—No.

62. It has been suggested that a colonial scale of staffs and salaries would tend to limit the powers of the Boards: do you agree with such a suggestion as that?—The general impression is that the powers of the Boards would be limited, inasmuch as they would have control over only one-fourth of the money they have at present. That is an objection, however, that I think of very little value.

63. Is the building grant which is at present allotted to your Board ear-marked for buildings, and buildings alone?—It is in our district.

64. And you are not allowed to pay anything out of it for teachers or expenses of Committees? —No.

65. Do you consider the ear-marking of the building grant for buildings an interference with the liberties of the Boards?—I do not.

66. The building grant and the colonial scale of salaries are precisely on the same lines?—That is so. I see no more objection to ear-marking the money for teachers' salaries than to ear-marking the building grant. There is no doubt, however, that the usual building grants at present paid will have to be increased 50 per cent. to meet the requirements of the colony.

67. Do you not think that would be an advantage, inasmuch as it would bring the Legislature of the colony face to face with the question of what the education of the people of the colony was really worth?—Yes. The payment of special grants during the last few years has been a great assistance. The Government have met a difficulty by giving grants for schools in new districts.

68. You spoke of some value being attached to the originality of Boards in the staffing of schools and payment of teachers: do you think that the members of Education Boards in the colony are sufficiently expert in education for the originality in this connection to be worth anything?—I do not think so. I am not aware that the Education Boards claim any expert knowledge of the staffing of schools, and I think they would be glad to be relieved of it.

69. Is it not a fact that the Legislature has made special provision for art schools and technical education outside of the ordinary vote?—I believe so, during the last few months.

70. That will get over the difficulty of these things not being provided for this district?—Yes.

71. You spoke of the difficulty of working two teachers in one room: do you not think that is very much a question of time-table?—It could be more easily arranged were it the case of a pupil-teacher working under the control of a certificated teacher. It is not so easy to arrange for the independent teaching of two teachers in a room 20 ft. by 20 ft., even with an alternation of noisy and silent work.

72. Would not the difficulty be quite as great with a pupil-teacher as with an assistant?—I am not prepared to say it would not.

73. *Mr. Hill.*] You say that if we had an equitable scale the finances of your Board would be improved?—It would make a vast difference to our teachers. So far as I can see, after what Mr. Hogben told me, and if some alteration were made in the payment of the 11s. 3d., the position of our Board, although perhaps not improved, would not be detrimentally affected.

74. Have you never used your Building Fund for maintenance purposes?—We may have borrowed against it, but we have never allocated or used one penny of it for any purpose other than that for which it is provided.

75. Do you think that a unified system would be preferable to the present thirteen different systems of classification and payment of teachers throughout the colony?—I think, almost anything would be preferable to the present methods.

76. Do you think that your Board should have the power of fixing the salaries and staffing the schools?—I am not prepared to say any such thing. I was speaking at that time of the differentiation of the rate of capitation to Boards.

77. Do you think that your Board would prefer an increase of 5s. in the capitation to the adoption of a colonial scale?—I am not prepared to say what my Board would prefer to have. My views are that if this district was levelled up all round to the level of Otago it would pay the teachers of this district more than would be the case with an increase of 5s. in the capitation to the Board.

78. Do you think that teachers doing the same work and having the same qualifications should have the same salary?—Undoubtedly.

79. Do you think that the payment should be estimated on the average attendance at the school, or upon the roll-number of the school, or on the number present during the week or quarter?—I think the most equitable system is on the average attendance, liberalised in this direction: that instead of calculating the working-average when the attendance falls below half the roll-number it should be increased to two-thirds of the roll-number—that is to say, that in a school of 30 pupils the working-average would commence to operate when there were less than 20 present, instead of when there were less than 15.

80. Of course, you are aware that the teacher is on duty at the school no matter how many pupils are away?—Yes. I think that the teacher should be paid on the average attendance, but that the attendance should not be subject to influences over which the teacher has no control, such as weather, and I do not think a teacher should be penalised because a parent keeps his child at home to dig potatoes.

81. Has your Board adopted any scheme for the promotion of teachers from school to school when vacancies occur?—They have adopted a system of regulations. In the appointment of teachers there are two or three things to be taken into consideration why a teacher should receive promotion; amongst them are classification, length of service, and fitness for the position.

82. Which is recognised as of greater importance—the educational status of the teacher or his technical skill?—I should almost say they were ranked of equal value. This Board takes both into consideration, but I do not know what weight is attached to each.

83. Does your Board take an A5 as being equal to E1?—No.

84. Which do you think is the preferable?—E1.

85. You recognise that technical skill is preferable to mere knowledge?—Certainly.

86. I notice that your regulations say that a female teacher in charge of a school shall be paid 10 per cent. less than a male in the same position: do you require females to do less work than males?—No.

87. And yet you pay them 10 per cent. less?—Yes.

88. If you pay them 10 per cent. less, do you find that you have more females making applications for schools than you have males?—Yes.

89. Do you get as good work from the females as from the males?—Yes.

90. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] How much do you get yearly for the building grant?—£3,400, I think, is the actual amount at present.

91. Does that include the grant for newly settled districts?—No.

92. How much have you received for newly settled districts?—About £600 or £700 to put up two new schools.

93. How many aided schools have you?—Twenty-two, if I remember rightly. We consider all schools aided which have an average attendance under 20.

94. What do you pay aided schools?—£4 per pupil.

95. Do you require a guarantee from the parents in these districts?—We sometimes fix £50 or £70 as the minimum salary, and ask the parents to guarantee that. We have had one or two instances where the guarantee has had to be made up.

96. Have you found that the members of the Board differ as much as teachers do in their idea as to the number of pupils a sole teacher can teach?—I do not think that the members set themselves up as experts in the matter of staffing schools. I think they use their best judgment, and they are very largely guided by experts—the Inspectors—in this matter.

97. *Mr. Weston.*] In the matter of staffing, the financial circumstances of the Board must necessarily be taken into consideration?—Yes.

98. So that not only expert knowledge but financial circumstances are involved?—Yes.

99. Is it or is it not so in your district, that as the buildings depreciate by time the expenses of repairs must increase?—Necessarily so.

100. It strengthens your argument that a colonial scale of salaries must be dependent upon the building grant being increased?—Inevitably so.

101. In considering the proposed scale, have you thought over the question of overstaffing?—In this district that is very easily regulated.

102. How?—In this way: For the last ten years it has been a standing order to me to bring up a report of the overstaffed schools in the district. In this district the Board has only one course of procedure, save in exceptional cases. When an overstaffed school is reported to the Board, the Board sends notice to the Committee that unless the attendance is raised to the proper status a teacher will be dispensed with the following quarter.

103. So that in reality a school is overstaffed for nine months before a teacher is dispensed with?—Yes; and it takes six months to reinstate a teacher.

104. Does the scale of salaries and the table prepared by Mr. Hogben show that the matter of overstaffing has been considered by the department?—I think not.

105. In your opinion as a teacher, the matter of overstaffing throughout the colony means a very large item?—Yes.

106. Does it not often arise, in considering overstaffing, that the circumstances of a school are such as to almost disentitle the Board reducing, even although the number attending would justly warrant the Board dismissing a teacher?—Such circumstances have not weighed with this Board. As a rule, when a school is overstaffed the Board sends out notice.

107. You make it a hard-and-fast rule?—I do not remember of one single instance where the rule has been relaxed, except in one or two cases where there have been severe epidemics.

108. I understood you to say that, in your opinion, the powers of the Board would not be very materially lessened by the introduction of a colonial scale of salaries?—Only in so far as they would require to spend that money in the way set down in the colonial scale of salaries.

109. You do not think that the Board, under the colonial scale, would be very much in the same position as School Committees are to-day?—I do not think so. Of course, the Board must be prepared to suffer some disability, otherwise such a scheme could not be brought in at all; but they would still have the power of selecting teachers, and all the administrative acts.

110. Do you think or do you not think that with a colonial scale, and with the curtailed powers of the Board, the School Committees will be necessary?—I see no reason why the duties of the School Committees should be interfered with by a colonial scale.

111. Would you not have two expensive institutions to perform very light work?—I do not look upon the Boards as expensive institutions, and I certainly think that School Committees could not be run on cheaper lines than they are. I do not know that a central system, pure and simple, would, in economy, exceed or equal the present one.

112. Would you, as secretary of the Board, be in a happy frame of mind if the appointment of teachers was left in the hands of a central department?—No, I do not consider it a wise step.

113. Why?—A central department at Wellington can never know as much as Education Boards know about teachers and the requirements of a district.

114. Is there any other reason?—I believe that unless you fix a hard-and-fast rule to appoint teachers according to grade, that the central department will make more mistakes than the Boards have done.

115. Would not the arguments you have advanced against the appointment of teachers from Wellington exist in regard to the centralisation of the Inspectors in Wellington?—It would have some of the same arguments against it. The Inspectors would cease to be officers of the Board, and all their instructions would have to come in a roundabout way from Wellington.

116. It would be with difficulty that you could ask and obtain advice from your Inspectors stationed at Wellington?—Yes; and to that extent I would not be in favour of the centralisation of Inspectors.

117. Do your two Inspectors take the schools alternately?—Yes.

118. Do you consider, for all practical purposes, that that is enough, and secures impartiality and sound inspection?—I think so.

119. Am I to understand, then, that in your opinion there exists no valid reason for the centralisation of the Inspectors?—I think not.

120. *Mr. Hogben.*] Can you furnish the Commission with a return, similar to that given by other secretaries of Education Boards, of the expenses of the Southland Education Board, other than for salaries, &c., for the years 1898, 1899, and 1900?—Yes.

121. You have alluded to the amount available for the Boards' expenses: did you notice that the amount that would be available under the suggested scheme was £5,400 more than was actually spent by the Boards during 1899?—No, I did not.

122. Then, it would simply be a question of a fair method of distribution, in order to place the Boards in a somewhat better position with regard to their expenses than they are now?—That is what I advocate. They should be placed in a considerably better position, because the elasticity of their finance is curtailed by the fact that three-fourths of their income is ear-marked.

123. Supposing that you said that for the first 500 children there should be so-much per head, and for the second 500 so-much per head, and for the next 2,000 so-much per head, and for the remainder above 3,000 so-much per head; does that suggest to your mind a way of solving the difficulty?—Yes, some such scheme as that, or a modification of it, would be more equitable than a fixed sum of 11s. 3d., because it would give to districts with a large number of small schools better treatment. I know that there are education districts in New Zealand which have a smaller number of schools than we have, and yet they have a larger average attendance. I take it that a Board's administration does not cost so much per pupil as so much per school, yet Boards are paid on the actual number in attendance at the schools instead of on the number of schools. At the same time, I think the differentiated rate you have mentioned would be a solution of the difficulty that presents itself to my mind.

124. You have noticed that the £250 to Boards, so far as it goes, has a partial effect in that way?—Yes, it has.

125. Would you be surprised to learn that the amount available under that suggested method of distribution gives to every Board as much as they were spending before for the same purpose?—That may be, but some Boards may have been more extravagant than others.

126. With regard to the increase of capitation, you would be able to say, perhaps, what the effect of that would be on the powers of the Board to give increased salaries?—It would increase our income by £2,000 a year, but the expenditure of that £2,000 would not, I think, be better for the teachers than a colonial scale coming up to the Otago level.

127. Have you worked out the amount that that would cost?—No.

128. Supposing that a sliding-scale of payment of capitation were to be drawn up, it should be such as would take into account all the things that the money provided according to that scale should meet?—Yes.

129. And the things that would have to be taken into account would be, on the one hand, the general expenses of the Board, and, on the other, the salaries payable to teachers?—Yes.

130. The more nearly the money that is paid to the Board approaches the total that would be necessary under the colonial scale the more nearly the Boards would be able to pay the salaries?—Yes.

131. So that, practically, a perfect sliding-scale comes with the payment to the Boards of the money required for the payment of staffs and salaries on the one side, and the money allotted for the payment of general expenses on the other side?—Yes.

132. Do you see any difference, then, between a perfect sliding-scale and a colonial-scale of staffs and salaries?—I see no material difference. My reason for referring to the sliding-scale was to show that the need for an alteration in the payments to Boards has existed for many years.

133. The next question that arises is whether a sliding-scale drawn up in accordance with the principles that appear to you to be just would insure the result that the Boards would pay over those salaries?—It would not. That is the weak point of the sliding-scale.

134. Then, it is quite possible that there would still be unequal salaries in different parts of the colony even if payments were made to the Boards on a sliding-scale of that kind?—Yes; they might exist almost to the same extent as now.

135. I understand you to say that the individuality of the Boards would be sunk to the extent that they would not be able to say what staff a school should have, and what salary a teacher should receive?—That is so; but I do not think either of them matter much.

136. With regard to the elasticity of the Board's finance, it is not to be expected that the Board's other expenses will come to the same amount every year?—No.

137. Has any of the money granted to School Committees been used for repairs?—Small sums of it; but it is only petty repairs that the Committees will undertake.

138. Are you not aware that it is legal for you to meet all expenses for repairs to buildings out of the building grant?—It is perfectly legal; but the Board is unable quite to do it out of the building grant. It is only the last two years that we have been able to keep within the building grant.

139. How many children do you think should be taught in a room 20 ft. by 20 ft.?—40 scholars can be accommodated on a 10 ft. square basis, but we have a lower limit than that. 8 ft. square has been the limit, but in the case of enlargements we are arranging for one of 10 ft. I do not admit that 8 ft. square is a proper limit, but we were forced into it.

140. Are you aware that the London School Boards have held that less than 12 ft. is insufficient?—I am not aware of the fact, but I am quite prepared to accept it, and say that for London it is little enough.

141. If such a room as this is just enough for 40 children, if the average rises much above 40 the room should in any case have to be increased?—Yes.

142. So that not only because of the staffing would it require to be increased, but it would have to be increased because it ought to be increased?—In the case of the staffing the increase of the school is a necessity, but in the case of the increase of the attendance it may not be necessary.

143. On the ideal staffing it would be necessary in any case?—Yes; but the ideal system can probably never be introduced. If a building that was built for 40 had only two additional scholars, the Board would not consider it so overcrowded as to warrant it in enlarging the school.

144. With regard to the stepping-stone between pupil-teachers and fully qualified teachers, I suppose you have noticed that there are other positions besides those of first assistants in small schools open to them—lower than the position of mistress?—Yes, I am aware of that, but in our district we have only two large schools.

145. You have five others that would require additional assistants?—Yes.

146. If you take the whole colony there would be a considerable number of those?—Yes; I look upon the appointment of a junior assistant as a first assistant after the headmaster in a school of 45 as a great advantage.

147. You suggest that what was formerly called the working-average—now the only average—should come in at two-thirds of the roll-number?—Yes.

148. You recognise, in that event, that it would be extremely necessary that the roll should be kept carefully purged?—Yes.

149. *The Chairman.*] Do you believe in a uniform scale of salaries for the colony?—I think a teacher teaching 50 pupils in one school should receive the same salary as a teacher doing the same work in any other part of the colony.

150. And that teachers are grossly underpaid?—I think they are greatly underpaid.

151. Do you think that the schools of New Zealand, from what you know of them, are sufficiently staffed at the present?—I have my doubts about the matter, and that is why I favour the appointment of assistants instead of pupil-teachers, although, of course, I think it is a mistake to appoint an assistant at 35 to 40.

152. Do you think they are understaffed?—I think the staffing of the Southland schools is fairly equitable.

153. What kind of capitation do you think would be sufficient for all purposes?—I think, £4 5s. in addition to the building grants.

154. In that case it would be very beneficial to the teachers?—I think so.

155. What effect would it have on the schools?—I think it would be a general benefit.

156. I understood you to say that one defect in any sliding-scale in connection with the ayment of salaries was that it would not insure the payment by the Boards of these salaries?—Certainly not; it could not do that unless a colonial scale was fixed.

157. Would not the same drawback apply in the payment of incidentals?—Yes.

158. I presume you have some exceptional cases to deal with?—Yes.

159. What happens when you have a teacher who has been a long time in the service, has done excellent work, and is capable still of doing it, but through the exigencies of a floating population—the removal of a sawmill or perhaps some industry from the locality—his school is reduced in number, and you have no suitable vacancy in which to place that teacher: what happens then?—I cannot see that anything would happen, except that that teacher would have favourable consideration given to any application he sent in for another vacancy.

160. Do you invariably reduce his salary?—We have no alternative.

161. I presume that you and the Board sympathize with the teachers who have worked themselves up in the service?—Yes, but that sympathy cannot be extended in any practical manner.

162. What do you do in the matter of teachers falling sick?—We pay one month's full pay, and after that we pay nothing. At one time we paid full pay for one month, and half-pay for the two succeeding months.

163. Do you think that a colonial scale of salaries would give universal satisfaction and meet every case?—I do not see why it should not give satisfaction.

164. Have you considered that the teachers who are in the back blocks and in out-of-the-way places suffer many discomforts, and that the cost of their living is high; and do you think that these teachers should receive just the same money as those living near to the railway, and close to large centres of population?—No great advantage can be gained, I suppose, without some disadvantage to the position. The only advantage that can come to these teachers is a move to another centre. But in the case of a teacher living in town there are far more opportunities to spend money, and there are far more calls on him than there are on those in the back blocks.

165. Have you had any experience of the back blocks?—Yes, I have.

166. Do you know the cost of bringing provisions into them?—Yes; I have not been in a place where we had to use a pack-horse, but I have been in places where we had to cart everything long distances.

167. But in such places there is no local storekeeper who is a Chairman of the School Committee to contend with?—No.

168. Do you think it is fair to reduce the salaries of pupil-teachers in the town because they will not go into the country?—I say it is an anomaly that they should be allowed to occupy these positions for an indefinite time. After they have finished their apprenticeship I think they should not be allowed six months in the town school at full pay.

169. Do you think that girls who are occupying useful positions, and whose services are really required, should be penalised because they refuse to break up their homes and leave the society of their friends?—It simply amounts to this: If we are not to look to the pupil-teachers to fill the vacancies, where are you going to fill them from? And if one pupil-teacher elects to stay in a town school at full pay it is a bad example to the others.

170. Supposing a pupil teacher is doing good work, should she be starved into the country because she will not leave town?—I see no hardship in that, at any rate.

171. If a colonial scale of salaries for teachers is adopted, what would you do with aged teachers who are unfit for work?—I think that a superannuation scheme should go along with a colonial scale of salaries.

172. You think they should have pensions?—Yes; partly provided by the State and partly by themselves.

173. Would you confine the pensions to teachers, or would you include the Inspectors?—There is no reason why the Inspectors and secretaries should not be included.

174. Would you include the members of the Board, too?—They ought to be included if they are a fixed quantity, but they are not.

175. *Mr. Weston.*] In your opinion, would the 12s. 6d. incidental allowance be enough to cover relief to sick teachers and the relatives of deceased teachers?—No, I do not think so. That should be an independent payment altogether.

176. You referred to the incidental expenses being placed on a fixed basis: would it be an improvement?—Yes; I do not think the Government can bring it down lower than it is.

W. H. Clark, Secretary of the Southland Branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute, examined.

177. *The Chairman.*] You are secretary of the Southland Branch?—Yes. As the secretary of the Board this morning, in dealing with the financial side of the question of a colonial scale, expressed the sentiments of Southland teachers very adequately, I shall confine my remarks in great measure to the question of staffing schools under the proposed colonial scale. In speaking of the original scale submitted, I am of the opinion that it is much more generous than any scale in force in almost any district of the colony, so far as the question of staffing is concerned. Generally, there is one more teacher than is allowed at present in the districts of South Canterbury, North Canterbury, Wellington, and Hawke's Bay; in the lowest division there is one and in the highest two more than we have at present in Southland. Possibly, in view of the fact that kindergarten work and technical teaching must be introduced into the schools at no distant date, it is advisable that some generosity in the scale in regard to staffing should be shown, and I think that the alternative scale to some extent supplies the additional staff required. A more serious

matter is the necessity of enlarged buildings in the schools in use at the present time, to meet the requirements of the original scale proposed. In most of the smaller schools more room will be required, and a considerable reduction in the number of pupils under the control of one teacher will result. The opinion of the teachers generally is that some little movement in the direction indicated should be made, in order that the alternative scale might be adapted to meet all the requirements. The Institute approves of the proposal that the first assistance to the staff should be given in the form of a certificated teacher. The difficulties of a teacher in a school of about 50, with a pupil-teacher only, are very much greater than in any other class of school, for he has practically to control the whole of the children, besides directing a very considerable portion of the work of his inexperienced assistant. The Southland Institute objects to the grading of the certificates, though in the suggested scale, with regard to the lowest class—E5—there is no objection taken. It will be difficult, no doubt, at times, to secure the services of a teacher of a higher grade for schools which have an average attendance under 19. The next class—E2—means the penalising of teachers in certain grades—one class and one division below the class and division assigned—to the extent of 5 per cent., and the tendency of such penalising would be to compel the teachers holding lower certificates in the grade than E2 to seek that class where they would not be penalised.

178. *Mr. Hogben.*] What would you suggest as the number instead of E2?—I do not suggest any particular number; I leave it to the Commission to suggest an improvement on that particular number. Another point is the certificate required for a school of from 75 to 100, D1. When one considers the fact that a teacher must have held a certificate and taught for at least a period of eleven years to gain his 1, I think it is a very small reward to offer a salary of £174 for such a certificate and such a position. I would also like to draw the attention of the Commission to the fact of the qualifications of assistants required, and that they cannot in some education districts obtain the marks necessary. Looking at the position of an assistant in the middle grade of schools, from 250 to 600 the required certificate is D2, and over the border-line into the higher grade of schools, with average above 600, B2. The salary of a first assistant male for a school of 600 is £220, and for one just over 600 the same salary. On the assumption that a school by increase of attendance rises from 599 to 601, the effect of the classification here would be that the teacher, on account of his holding a D3 certificate, would be penalised to the extent of £15, or 1 per cent. on the letter and 4 per cent. on the figure. In regard to another point, the retention of a female teacher as head of a school: in a school rising over 300 such a scheme would be inoperative—*ie.*, in mixed schools. It would be impossible for almost any female teacher to manage such a school, and I doubt if there would be many willing to undertake the task. In the larger schools the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards are confessedly beyond the power of most female teachers, and, at any rate, there is no doubt that a difficulty would be encountered in securing the services of such teachers. The first assistant in a school of the middle grade would be necessarily a male, and the second assistant would be a female, and in consequence of so being would be expected to occupy the position of teaching Standard V. Such a standard, numerically, would be equal to about 50, which is nothing unusual in the upper classes in the larger schools, and would be beyond the control of more than nine-tenths of the female assistants of the colony. Unless the head-teacher brought his influence to bear, it would be difficult indeed for her to obtain even a very small amount of work from such pupils. In the higher division of the schools the suggested scale allows of having a head of the boys' department and a head of the girls' department, but there is no increase in salary offered to the head of the boys' department, as compared with the first assistant in the middle class of schools, while his responsibility would be considerably increased. Possibly it might be contemplated to divide the sexes, placing the boys' department entirely under the control of a head of the boys' department, and the girls' department entirely under the control of a head of the girls' department. Such a course would be a very great waste of teaching energy, for it is found that, though the sexes are separated, the same amount of work requires to be done with each. I should like to make a few remarks with regard to pupil-teachers. Mr. Neill pointed out this morning the manner in which the Southland Education Board deals with the appointment of pupil-teachers, and I may say that it meets with the general approval of the teachers in Southland. We recognise that it is very difficult to obtain the services of boys; indeed, boys are most unwilling to enter the teaching profession from the fact that there is so little hope extended to them for making anything like substantial progress in the service. I have taken the liberty of compiling a few figures from the returns in Education Reports during the last ten years, and these show that there has been a steady growth in the number of female teachers and female pupil-teachers employed in the service, whereas the number of male certificated teachers has grown at a very much slower rate, and the male pupil-teachers are actually fewer than the number employed ten years ago. For December of the year 1891 there were 1,080 male certificated teachers holding positions in schools, and 998 female teachers; the male pupil-teachers were 243, and the female pupil-teachers 744, giving a total of 3,065 teachers—43·2 per cent. of males and 56·8 per cent. of females—the percentage of certificated teachers being males 52 per cent., females 48 per cent. In the last report, to the end of the year 1899, the male teachers were 1,221, and the females 1,372; the male pupil-teachers 230, and the female pupil-teachers 792: the proportion being 40·1 per cent. males, and 59·9 per cent. females. The increase of male teachers was 141, and of females 374; the decrease of male pupil-teachers was 13, and the increase of female pupil-teachers 48. I think these figures show that the service has not the same attraction for males as for females, and yet the teaching profession for a female is only an episode in her life, while a male, as a general rule, takes it up seriously as a profession for life. While on this point I may state I frequently receive communications from teachers on a variety of subjects, and I have before me a letter which I received a day or two ago from a teacher who not very long since left the teaching profession. He has left for another part of the colony, where he

has met many teachers, and his conversation with them is indicated in this extract from a letter, in which he says, "Most of the teachers I have met, masters and assistants alike, cry 'Lucky beggar,' and some lament their inability to do likewise"—that is, gentlemen, to follow his example in leaving the scholastic profession for some other sphere in life. With regard to the causes of dissatisfaction among the school-teachers, I should like to say there are three causes that I am able to adduce. The first is the lowness in the salaries paid to males, the average salary for the colony being about £100. The great bulk of the schools are small, and the difficulty of moving from one school to another—or, rather, from one district to another—is so great that there is very little hope of promotion. The second is that most of the teachers find promotion exceedingly slow. To give an example—and it is better to deal with concrete facts than generalities—I might indicate the career of two youths that I myself taught some ten years ago. These two lads were working together with others in the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Standards; a pupil-teacher happened to be wanted, and both these lads applied for the position, one of them being successful. The unsuccessful boy sought admission into the Civil Service, and obtained an appointment. The pupil-teacher, after a successful course, now receives a salary of £130 or £140, whereas the other lad is now receiving a salary of over £200. The third serious objection of the teachers of this district is to the operation of provincialism in the making of appointments. In this connection I take the liberty of quoting an answer made by the secretary of the Otago Education Board to a question addressed by a member of this Commission to him, which was as follows: "Most of the teachers who apply for appointments in Otago are not very highly classified, and very often they have to be thrown out because their classification is not high enough for the position they wish to fill." (*Otago Daily Times*, 17th May, 1901.) In private life that answer would be characterized in very plain language, and I am prepared to prove that the statement is entirely contrary to fact. If the Commission wish it, I shall give my own personal experience, which I think will be sufficient to prove that the statement, or the answer referred to is entirely erroneous. Otago is not the only offender in the exclusion of what are called "outsiders"; but it can, at the same time, be safely said that Otago is the worst. I shall now ask you to consider the salaries paid to assistants. First, we object to the alternation of male and female assistants. The salaries, we consider, should be made in accordance with the requirements of the schools, and with regard to the particular positions required to be filled by assistants. The reduction in the lowest class of school on the second assistant's salary should be specially noted. The object of the Commission is to find out what should be the living-wage for teachers, and I am inclined to think, with most teachers, that the salary of £80 or £90 proposed to be paid to the second assistant is entirely inadequate for the position. It is actually less than is paid in most cases to an unskilled labourer engaged to work in most of the districts where the services of such second assistants would be required, and I think it is very unfair to ask a comparatively skilled man to accept less remuneration than would be paid to a labourer engaged in the harvest-field or in ordinary farm-work within sight of the schools where the assistants would be engaged.

179. What class of schools are you referring to?—The second grade, allowing two assistants, where the first assistant requires to be a female, and the second assistant necessarily a male, according to the requirements of the scale.

180. You are in error; the note on page 5 says, "In mixed schools from 36 to 250," &c.: there is no rule of alternation there. The rule is further down where it says there must not be more masters than mistresses?—Well, it seems to me that the individual styled here the second assistant would be necessarily a male teacher, and, so far as I have been able to examine the staffing in Otago and other districts, such assistant is generally a male teacher. Not infrequently does it happen that such young men are married, and £90 a year is very inadequate for the support of a wife and family. In regard to the salaries paid to infant mistresses, in a school of 250 the first assistant is necessarily a female teacher, and the salary rises from £80 to £105; in a school of from 100 to 150 the salary is £90, and the mistress would certainly have control of the infant division, which would comprise infant classes, and Standard I. at any rate, and possibly—nay, very probably—Standard II. In the division from 250 to 600 the infant mistress would have charge of the infant division, consisting of infant classes only, the First Standard being most probably in charge of one of the junior assistants, or in charge of a competent pupil-teacher in her last year. In that case the salary paid to the infant mistress steadily increases from £105 to £175, and her responsibility decreases.

181. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is your teaching experience?—I have taught in Southland seventeen years; in the Old Country I had some experience as a pupil-teacher.

182. What class of schools have you taught in?—In the lowest and highest grades as shown in the proposed scale. I held the position of first male assistant in one of the largest class of schools (over 600).

183. What is the average attendance of your school at present?—The average attendance at the Lumsden School is nearly 120.

184. What is the staffing of the school?—A headmaster, mistress, and pupil-teacher, practically the same as allowed by the proposed alternative scheme submitted.

185. In the original scale an assistant mistress was allowed when the attendance reached 35: I understood you object to the staffing of a school in that grade?—No; I cordially approve of the proposal to add a mistress to the staff as the first addition.

186. You do not think 35 too low an average attendance at which to introduce assistance in the form of an assistant?—It is only a matter of detail as to whether it should be 35 or 40. I am willing the number should be 40; a teacher can manage a school from 35 to 40 without much assistance.

187. Do you think the efficiency of the school would suffer by raising the average attendance to 40 before the admission of an assistant?—No.

188. What is the staffing allowed in a school of 50?—A head-teacher and a pupil-teacher; 45 is the number at which a pupil-teacher is added in Southland at present.

189. Under the scale I have before me I find there is no assistance allowed until the number reaches 50: is that so?—There was an alteration of that rule some years ago reducing the number to 45.

190. Do you think the staffing suggested in the alternative scale is better than is provided under the Southland regulations?—With the difference of the reduction from 45 to 40, and making the first assistance to the staff in the form of a certificated teacher, the Southland scale and the alternative scale are nearly identical.

191. Under the regulations of the Southland Board at the present time a certificated assistant is not allowed until the average attendance reaches 75: is that not so?—Below 70, from 65, a junior assistant is appointed.

192. When do you think a pupil-teacher should be added to the staff in addition to the head-master and mistress?—The alternative scheme suggests 90; the Southland scale 110. I find, from my own experience, that between 100 and 110 it is rather difficult for a head-teacher and mistress to manage, and I approve of the proposed addition at 90.

193. Are you personally in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes, and have been for a considerable time.

194. Do you think the difficulty of inducing the right class of boy to enter the teaching profession would be probably reduced or removed if the salaries throughout the colony were uniform, and up to at least the highest standard now paid in any part of the colony?—I believe there would be a tendency, at any rate, in that direction.

195. The number of suitable vacancies would be very largely increased, would it not?—I think so.

196. The number of positions in which the salaries are extremely low in some of the districts very probably would be greatly reduced?—Yes, that is so; I think there would be a number of suitable candidates seeking admission to the profession.

197. You object to the required certificate for certain positions?—Yes; I object to the grading, which I think should be more gradual.

198. Do you think, if that part of the scheme were cut out altogether, and the question of the minimum qualification for certain positions was left to be dealt with apart from this scheme, it would simplify matters?—I think some scheme of grading should be adopted, or some minimum certificate clearly indicated for the various positions. If such a scheme were not adopted there would be practically no incentive to teachers to improve their status.

199. Then, if that part of the scheme were cut out altogether, and a minimum qualification such as you suggested were to form part of another scheme altogether, it would make this less complicated?—I consider, at any rate, that it should be clearly understood that the better class of appointment should be reserved for the better class of certificate.

200. *Mr. Stewart.*] I believe you are the secretary of the Southland Branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute, and that you are also president-elect of the Institute for the colony?—I have that honour.

201. Is the Southland Branch of the Educational Institute in favour or not in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries, as a branch?—The Southland teachers as a whole, including many who are not members of the Institute, are in favour of a colonial scale.

202. Did you have an opportunity of judging what was the opinion in January last of the whole of the council assembled, representing every educational institute in New Zealand, on the question of a colonial scale?—So far as I can remember, the council was practically unanimous in favour of the proposal for a colonial scale.

203. Is it not a fact that when the question was put as to whether the council should say they were in favour of a colonial scale or not, every member of the council rose to his feet and replied in the affirmative?—Yes.

204. Including representatives from Otago?—Yes, and from every education district in the colony—representatives of teachers of the colony from all grades of schools.

205. It made very clear the opinion of the teachers of the colony on the matter of a colonial scale?—Yes; I think I am safe in saying that 95 per cent. of the teachers of the colony are in favour of a colonial scale.

206. You spoke of the difficulty of getting young men to enter the profession: do you think the uncertainty as to what may be the rates of pay in two or three years' time, and the present spirit of provincialism, has determined parents not to allow their sons to embark upon that profession—*i.e.*, the teaching profession?—Yes, on account of the uncertainty of obtaining fair remuneration in a few years' time.

207. Do parents ever ask for your advice as to whether their boys should become teachers?—Yes, and I have advised boys not to; and only recently a vacancy for a pupil-teacher occurred, for which I declined to allow my own nephew to apply.

208. Do you think, judging from various circumstances, and as a teacher and secretary of the Southland Branch of the Institute, that a colonial scale of staff and salaries is the best solution of the difficulty?—It would, at any rate, lessen the difficulties very considerably.

209. You understand that there is no proposal whatever, even in evidence before the Commission, to interfere with appointments of teachers, and the control of teachers by the Boards of Education?—So far as the Southland teachers are concerned, I think they would at present demur to any serious interference with the Boards' rights in the matter of appointment of their teachers.

210. Are you aware that such a step is not contemplated?—I am not aware of anything proposed in that direction.

211. Then, the Southland teachers would favour the solution of the difficulty I proposed?—I believe, as a whole, they would.

212. Have you ever been an applicant for a position outside your own district?—Yes, I have been.

213. What is your classification?—B1.

214. The second in rank?—Yes; and according to the *Gazette* issued last June, the second rank, in which there are only eighty-nine teachers in the colony employed under the Education Department.

215. You referred to a statement given in evidence in another part of the colony, as to whether outside teachers of high classification had ever been rejected for appointment under another Board. We have your classification in evidence: have you ever applied to the Otago Education Board for an appointment under the Board?—Yes, frequently.

216. With what result?—The result that I am still in Southland. I will give you an example of Otago's treatment in my particular case. The incident I refer to took place some years ago. I applied for a position very little better financially than the position I am at present occupying. My application was sent out to the Committee; I was unsuccessful; but I learned some time afterwards that the successful candidate beat me by one vote, the voting being four to three in his favour, and that he was of the same classification as myself. Within ten months after that I received a letter from the Chairman of the School Committee intimating to me that the gentleman who beat me for the position had resigned on account of ill-health, and stating that if I were willing to apply for the vacancy, and the Education Board sent out my application, no other teacher would obtain the position. Considering that as an invitation from the Chairman, I sent in my application, but it was not forwarded to the Committee; and that was exactly ten months after the previous case, when it was sent.

217. *Mr. Hill.*] You have read, I suppose carefully, this proposed scheme of classification?—I have examined it.

218. Suppose, instead of the arrangement of male and female alternating, it was left a purely optional question in the hands of Education Boards as to the appointment of a male or female, do you think it would be an improvement on the present proposal?—I think that the appointment of assistants might be made to suit the requirements of the particular school being dealt with.

219. You mean that the Boards would very possibly better adapt the staffing to the needs of the district?—Yes, as to the appointment of a male or a female.

220. Would you still pay the same salaries as indicated in the table? If the Board decided on the appointment of a male or a female to any school, would you pay the same salaries irrespective of sex?—Yes. I cordially support the proposal that the Boards should appoint male or female teachers, as they think best suited to the requirements of schools in particular districts.

221. You would also suggest that, instead of the appointment of pupil-teachers, an assistant teacher should be appointed in the place of two pupil-teachers if the Board found it necessary to do so, or thought it advisable to do so?—Yes; that alternative has been adopted in Southland on more than one occasion, and very successfully too. I should certainly approve of some elasticity in the scale.

222. Do you think it would be for the benefit of education generally?—Yes, I think it would.

223. What is the average attendance at your school?—About 120.

224. Have you had experience in large schools?—Yes, I have taught in a school of over 600 in attendance.

225. What, in your opinion, should be the maximum size of a school in order that the school may be efficiently taught and managed?—I do not think it should go beyond 800.

226. Why 800?—When the attendance rises much beyond that it is impossible for the headmaster to come into anything like close contact with the children of his school, and I think it is very necessary that the headmaster of any school should come into contact very frequently with every child who is under his charge.

227. Do not the standard classes duplicate, on the average, when an attendance of 600 is reached?—On the average, they do not at that number. I think when the attendance approaches 800 the classes begin to duplicate—more often the lower classes. When the attendance rises over 800 the probability would be for all the classes to duplicate.

228. With regard to the arrangement of teachers, do you think that the first and second assistants appointed should have the right to take Standards VII. and VI., or Standards VI. and V., respectively: do you think that they should claim those standards as their right to teach?—No, I do not think they should claim that right.

229. Do you think it advisable to recognise their right in that respect?—On the whole, I think it should be considered the first assistant or the headmaster's duty to take charge of those classes.

230. Do you think that in such schools the headmaster should have the right to arrange his staff as he thinks in the best interests of the school and the welfare of the children under his charge?—They have that right at the present time.

231. Do they exercise it?—I believe they do.

232. Is there no demur to the exercising of such power in this district, so far as you are aware?—I believe there might be.

233. Supposing, for instance, a headmaster were to remove the infant mistress to take charge of a lower standard class, do you think she should have the right to demur?—If she held the position of infant mistress she would have the right to demur.

234. Why should she?—The appointment in that name gives her the right to consider the charge of the infant department as hers.

235. Do you think it right, and in the interests and well-being of the schools, that an infant mistress should be so appointed?—So far as my experience goes, I think such a woman best adapted to control the infant department.

236. Are the children trained in kindergarten work?—They get some part of kindergarten work.

237. That instruction is given?—Yes.

238. And they are prepared to train the infant children?—Some of them have not the natural adaptability to do so, of course.

239. Assuming there are a number of them who possess that adaptability, and that young female teachers are the best to put in charge of the infants, would you debar them from doing so?—Of course, a head-teacher would certainly place such young female teachers in charge of classes where their work would be of the most useful kind.

240. Do you recognise a headmaster's right to do as he thinks fit with his staff irrespective of what the infant mistress might think?—If it was in the general interests of the school, a headmaster should be able to do so.

241. Most of the teachers are class-teachers, are they not?—Yes, most of them.

242. They exercise very little control except in their own class-rooms?—Yes, that is so.

243. And other teachers are very jealous of the control outside teachers—that is, teachers of other classes in the school—exercise over the children in their own particular classes?—Sometimes. It depends on the *esprit de corps* of the staff.

244. *Mr. Weston.*] Being in a school as headmaster, with an infant mistress and headmistress, would you not think the infant mistress and the headmistress entitled to carry on their departments according to their own way without reference to the headmaster?—Not necessarily; the headmaster is duly responsible for the whole school, and he would be able to exercise his right to interfere with the work in any division.

245. The infant mistress has the control of the infant department, and, that being the case, I should think, speaking as a novice, would be better able to judge as to the requirements of that department than another person carrying on a different branch. There would be an appeal to the Board in the event of a difference, would there not? I will ask you what you would do?—I have not been placed in such a position; I do not think such a condition should arise. Of course, if the infant mistress and headmaster did not agree over the matter, and if she refused to do as he would wish, they would have to appeal to the Board, certainly.

246. Although such a case might arise, it would not be likely?—No; I think the chances are very remote.

247. You say that a large percentage of the teachers of the colony approve of a colonial scale?—Yes.

248. Have the teachers considered the possibility of the House of Representatives at any time fixing by vote the salaries on a lower scale than such as we might now advocate?—Most of the teachers realise the fact that such a contingency is possible, but the uncertainty that at present exists is very much greater than the uncertainty of such a condition as you suggest.

249. Have you considered the question of allowances to teachers in the case of sickness, and allowances to teachers' representatives in the case of death? You receive in the case of sickness one month's pay?—Yes.

250. Then, in the case of death, do not the representatives of the teachers get anything at all?—No, they do not get anything.

251. Have the teachers considered whether or not provision should be made, either by Boards, by the Government, or by whichever of the two has the control of the purse?—With regard to the question of sick-allowance, we have given little consideration to the matter; we have, no doubt, thought that some elasticity should be given to the scheme to allow something to be done as is at present done by the Southland Board. As regards the death of a teacher, there is no consideration given to the question in the manner you suggest.

252. Are the teachers as a whole satisfied with the present provision for their relief in case of sickness?—They are not altogether satisfied with the allowance now paid, for it is, of course, quite possible that a teacher may be laid up for a period very much longer than one month, and there is no allowance made beyone one month. I have known of cases where teachers have had to return to their duties after being off on sick-leave, because their financial position would not allow them to remain away longer without their salaries going on—that is, though ill, they were unable to take sick-leave for a longer period than one month, for they could not afford the loss of their salaries.

253. Then, the teachers are not satisfied with the present condition of affairs?—Not altogether; but they do not see any way of altering things.

254. With regard to the question of a superannuation fund, you said you were in favour of a superannuation scheme?—Personally, I am; but the teachers of the colony are, I believe, divided on the point.

255. Have you considered, in the matter of a superannuation fund, two things—first, the uncertainty as to the continuance of the present system of education; and, secondly, as to the possibility of salaries being still further reduced?—The teachers consider that the remuneration is not sufficiently adequate to allow them to save to any great extent, and they view with some misgivings what may be the conditions when age or broken health incapacitates them from earning their salaries as teachers. I think that is the view they take of the matter.

256. As a rule they cannot save?—No.

257. Taking the salaries that are paid now in so many cases, in your opinion would the teachers as a body be able to pay into the Treasury such an annual sum as would give them solid relief in the case of sickness or old age?—The present salaries paid entirely preclude that possibility. The Institute has during recent years made some inquiry; the department has been addressed on more than one occasion, and we have been informed that it is almost impossible under present conditions to institute such a fund. The difficulties in the way prevented our going so far into the matter as we would otherwise have gone.

258. Which do you think the generality of teachers would prefer—a position under the Boards as they now have and hold, or to be officers of the General Government: have the teachers either in or out of the Educational Institute discussed that question?—The question of having the teachers brought under the operation of the Superannuation Act for the Civil Service has been discussed, but the question of removing the teachers from the control of the Boards and placing them under the central department has not been discussed; and, speaking from a fairly intimate knowledge of the teachers, I do not think such a proposal would meet with their general approval.

259. Could you give some little information in regard to overstaffing: do you think that the question of staffing and the calls upon the Boards could be made upon the £4 capitation grant?—I have not gone into the question so fully as to warrant my attempting to give any information upon the matter.

260. *Mr. Hogben.*] Supposing that the average attendance on which payments were to be made was based on a period of something like a year, instead of a shorter period, such as one quarter, would that not have the tendency of making the salaries of teachers more stable?—I do not think it would be advantageous, for this reason: It would be quite possible that at the beginning of the year the attendance in a school might be very considerable, and through some sudden change drop towards the end of the year very materially, and that would lessen the amount payable and the number of the staff for the following year, when these temporary causes might soon be removed.

261. But if you took the attendance for the whole year the temporary causes would disappear, so far as the effect on the salaries were concerned—that is, if you took four quarters instead of one?—The temporary causes might be in operation more than one-half of the year. I think the shorter periods more preferable.

262. Taking those temporary causes as they usually occur, you would get a greater salary if you took four quarters than only one?—In the colony as a whole the effect would not be very material, I suppose. Disturbing causes would only occur occasionally.

263. The average attendances for some quarters are much lower than in others throughout the colony generally?—Yes; the harvest quarter is generally the lowest.

264. No; it is the September quarter. However, is it not proved generally that there is some quarter in every district lower than another?—Yes.

265. Then, if the average was taken for the four quarters, would it not be better, seeing that the teachers would know pretty well what their salaries would be for the year?—Teachers seek something more stable. I do not think taking the average for the whole year would have that effect, and I think that the taking of the averages quarterly, as at present, better.

266. During the course of a year, is it not within your experience that the attendance of a school might go up above, say, 40 for part of the year, and then down below 40 for another part of the year?—Yes, that happens occasionally.

267. Is that the reason that would give cause to temporary overstaffing?—Yes.

268. Was that present in your mind when you answered that question?—Yes, to some extent.

269. For some periods of the year you would give the staffing on the attendance for the year?—Yes.

270. The question of overstaffing, to some extent, is minimised by taking the average attendance over a long period. This bugbear of overstaffing would largely disappear if the period over which the average was taken was a yearly period, would it not?—The modifications in the staffing would be less likely to appear.

271. You want to prevent modifications of the staff for rises and falls of averages?—The tendency would be to prevent the changes, but the schools very generally would be understaffed.

272. Supposing that for some quarters of the year a school did rise to one or two above 40, would it be a very serious affliction for that school to be without an assistant mistress for a short period?—A capable teacher would be able to carry on work without a mistress for some time.

273. Would it not be rather a disadvantage if you were to give a mistress, and the headmaster had to rearrange his work on that account, and also, after the fall in attendance took place, to undo what he had previously done?—Yes, probably.

274. You could balance the overstaffing to a very large extent against the understaffing?—Yes, to some extent.

275. You think there ought to be for cases of sickness, to meet what would be otherwise overstaffing, relieving teachers?—Relieving-teachers are a great convenience.

276. With regard to allowance in case of sickness or death to relatives, you would recognise that, in cases of sickness of teachers, if the Board had a relieving-teacher it would not complicate its finances at all by having to pay the other teacher his salary?—No, there would be no complication.

277. If the relieving-teacher were separately dealt with it would not complicate the finances of the Board: that is your opinion on that point?—Yes; there would be a possibility of greater generosity.

278. Do you know any of the teachers of Native schools?—No.

279. You are not aware that they have sometimes had sick-leave as long as six months?—No.

280. With regard to the elasticity in staffing, you recognise that, if we were to allow full choice in the matter of male and female teachers, to substitute a male for a female teacher would be to increase the cost of the staffing of the school?—Yes.

281. So that unless you are prepared to increase the cost of the staffing of the schools you could not allow such choice without any limitation whatever?—Of course, some limit should be required to be assigned; it would be unwise to allow the possibility of appointing the whole staff male teachers.

282. Would you be in favour of an adaptation of the figures as would, with the smallest limitation possible, leave the Board the choice of whether a male or a female teacher should be put in?—Yes.

In the first grade of school, under 250, the assistant, after the appointment of an infant mistress, should be a male teacher; and in the second grade of school, between 250 and 480, the first two assistants should be males, and up to 600 the first three assistants males. The male teachers then would occupy the higher positions and the female teachers the lower positions, as at present in most districts.

283. In answer to my question as to whether you would allow, within certain limits, choice to the Boards to say whether a male or female teacher should be appointed, you are of the opinion that it would not increase to any appreciable extent the cost of the scheme?—I do not think it would.

284. With regard to certificates, the deductions from the certificates, I may inform you, amount to £10,096 now, and they have been actually made in the estimate given here for all existing teachers in the colony: you would prefer, I presume, from your answers, to see those deductions swept away, as deductions?—Yes.

285. Supposing that £10,000 had to be saved in order to keep up the £4 capitation basis, would you prefer that the deductions should be spread over the whole of the teachers of the colony?—I think it would be the most just method to do that. The case I adduced of a school rising from 599 to 601 would mean the penalising of the D3 teacher to the extent of £13.

286. *Mr. Davidson.*] Is the probability of a D3 holding that position in a school of that size likely?—The chances are against it, certainly.

287. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you notice that the deduction from the lower certificates is only an inverse method of bonuses to higher certificates?—It is a bonus of a negative kind.

288. *Mr. Weston.*] In regard to this superannuation fund, the evidence to-day, if I am not in error, has shown to us that there is a possibility of male teachers retiring, and leaving the schools with a probability of losing what they have paid in, or that they might be unable to keep up their quarterly or yearly premiums: would not that possibility have some weight with the teachers in regard to the question of superannuation?—I believe one cause of teachers being so lukewarm, or somewhat so, on the question of a superannuation fund is that possibility, the insecurity of tenure, and the uncertainty of salary; those are contributing causes.

289. *The Chairman.*] Do you consider the schools in Southland you are acquainted with are sufficiently staffed at the present time?—They are not overstaffed as a whole, and the teachers, as a rule, can overtake their work with a fair degree of ease. In some cases, of course, the energies of the teachers are somewhat taxed, especially when nearing the limit at which additional assistance is granted.

290. Then, do you think the schools are insufficiently staffed?—No; on the whole, I think the staffing is fairly adequate.

291. Is the teaching in the schools, in your opinion, of an efficient character?—I think so, judging from the Inspectors' reports: on the whole it is.

292. During the time you have been acquainted with the schools in this district, can you say whether primary education has been going backwards, or is it going forward?—I should certainly say that it has not deteriorated. I think the quality of the teaching fairly equal now to what it was when I started in Southland. The majority of the teachers now in the service of the Board—or many of them, at any rate—were in the Board's service when I entered it, and their experience has increased, and consequently is more efficient.

293. From the reply you have have just given, I assume that there are not many teachers leaving the service to go into other professions?—Yes; I know of quite a number—for instance, there was the case of the teacher which I quoted in my opening remarks.

294. Was he a young man or an experienced teacher?—A young man, with a considerable amount of experience.

295. How long was he in the service, approximately?—After having served his pupil-teacher course, I suppose he served five or six years.

296. Can you mention any cases of experienced teachers leaving the profession for other occupations?—Yes.

297. Many?—I think, during the last three or four years, some four or five Southland male teachers have left the service to enter other businesses.

298. You say that one of the causes of dissatisfaction is the low salaries paid?—The majority of these men have left the service on that account.

299. Who get the low salaries, the male or female teachers?—The male teachers in comparatively small schools get low salaries; the low salaries paid is certainly one of the contributing causes to males leaving the profession.

300. What class of teachers in this district are receiving £100 and under a year?—The female teachers; there are very few males receiving less than £115.

301. Do you think the salaries paid to the female teachers adequate?—I think the female teachers as a whole do not consider that the salaries paid them are inadequate: they are more willing to retain their positions than the males I indicated.

302. It is stated that, if the Board had the choice of male and female teachers in increasing the staffs, the cost would be increased by the employment of males: why would it be so?—As Mr. Neill indicated this morning, the male teachers expect a somewhat larger salary than the females, for they have more dependent on them.

303. In that case the Boards would prefer the high-priced article?—The Southland Board prefers male teachers if able to get them; but the complaint throughout the colony is the scarcity of the supply of male pupil-teachers.

304. Is not this because the demand for male labour has improved here as in other parts of the colony?—The cause of it is that males have more desire to enter other professions in which greater inducements are held out than in the teaching profession.

305. Considering the fact that there is about the same number of girls as boys receiving education, that statistics prove the sexes to be nearly equally divided in the schools, and that a very large number of those receiving education are infants or very young children, do you think that male or female teachers should predominate?—Speaking from the figures I have submitted, in December, 1891, the male teachers predominated, and the farther back you go this fact is more noticeable. In 1885, for example, the percentage of male teachers was 56 per cent. to 44 per cent. of females. During the intervening fifteen years there has been a decrease in the number of male teachers to the extent of 10 per cent., and a corresponding increase in the number of females.

306. You say that, notwithstanding this, the education carried on in the schools is of a thoroughly efficient character, and that it has been proved so?—It proves that the quality of the teaching is satisfactory with the female staffing. The boys are "fighting shy" of the profession entirely; and in the case of the female teachers, in most cases they do not consider that they are adopting a life profession, and therefore, as a rule, they do not throw the same energy into their work as boys.

307. Has it ever occurred to you that that may be due to the fact that they do not receive the same salaries as males?—I have not heard that opinion expressed.

308. You say that another cause of dissatisfaction is that when vacancies occur outsiders have not the same chance when competing for those vacancies as teachers within the provinces where the vacancies occur?—Yes; they have no chance in very many cases.

309. Assuming that vacancies occurred in large schools in Wellington or Otago, for instance, do you think that the teachers in this district would have much chance of being considered for the appointments?—I have already indicated that in Otago, at any rate, they would have no chance. I was informed on one occasion from Auckland that such appointments as I offered my services for were reserved for that Board's own servants.

310. In your opinion, should the appointments and promotions remain vested in Boards or be placed in the hands of the central department?—If the Boards acted justly——

311. But you say that they do not?—Assuming they do so, if they choose applicants on their merits the present system is certainly the preferable one. I think the teachers, as a general rule, object to the appointments being made by the central department.

312. Why should they object: would the teachers not be more fairly treated?—The central department has not the same means of becoming acquainted with the character of individual teachers as the Boards have.

313. Could not the central department be kept thoroughly conversant with the character and general conduct of teachers from the Inspectors?—The staffing of the department would have to be considerably increased to secure that result.

314. Do you not think it would be an improvement on the present system if the central department had that power?—The central department could not manage individual schools in anything like the manner the Education Boards do now. From the geographical character of the colony it is necessary to have local bodies of some kind. It is impossible to sweep away Boards and manage the whole education system only through the central department.

315. You have already said that one of the causes of dissatisfaction among the teachers is intense provincialism: in what way would you propose to get rid of that?—Reciprocity between the Boards would do so.

316. How would that reciprocity be brought about?—If the other Boards in the colony acted on the same principle as the Southland Board—which is, to receive such applications as come from other education districts, consider the applications on their merits, and, if an outside candidate is most suitable, to appoint him. We ask that Boards should be entirely impartial in the consideration of applications, and the Southland Board is so.

317. Other things being equal, do you think the Boards are justified in giving preference to their own teachers in the matter of appointments?—Other things being entirely equal, they would certainly be justified in so doing.

318. With regard to the matter of superannuation, do you think teachers themselves would be in favour of compulsory insurance—of a deduction being made from their salaries in order to provide for a pension fund?—I know the teachers are somewhat divided on that point.

319. I presume a good many of them are members of friendly societies—that they have already made some provision?—A large number of teachers are insured I know, some of them, too, being members of friendly societies, and these teachers, of course, possibly would have some objection.

G. R. George, Member of the Southland Education Board, examined.

Mr. George: With the permission of the Commission I will confine myself to answering questions under examination.

320. *Mr. Davidson.*] Instead of having, as at present, thirteen different scales of staff and salaries, do you think our education system would become still more truly a national one if we had a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Of course, we have received a copy of the proposed scale; and, taking into consideration that there are thirteen different districts, and that the geographical conditions vary considerably in so many of the districts, necessitating special consideration being given to some of them, I think it is not advisable to have a colonial scale. I think the money should be given to the Boards, who would make better use of it. As an instance of showing how we are circumstanced in regard to certain small schools in out-of-the-way districts, and the method of paying the salaries of the teachers in connection with them, I might mention two schools, one at Preservation Inlet and another at Waikawa, both inaccessible places, where the teachers are practically separated from civilisation, and where it costs them a considerable amount of money to come to the centres when such a course is desirable. In these cases we have, during

the last two or three years, introduced a minimum salary, as the salary based on the attendance is not sufficient. The Board takes note of these places when the return is made quarterly; it reviews them, and places certain of these schools under the minimum-salary scale. We are thus enabled to subsidise teachers. If they had been paid on the capitation grant we would have been unable to get suitable teachers. In some places we have schools established where the attendance has considerably declined—we have two schools with only an average attendance of 8—and it is the practice of the Board to inquire from the residents whether they wish their schools to be kept open, and, if so, they have to subsidise the salaries of the teachers. We very often do not appoint teachers with very much experience; we very often find that novices are willing to take these positions, where they can gain experience, and have an opportunity of awaiting for a better appointment. We get teachers in this manner, and the children get the benefits of education. I think if we were restricted to a colonial scale the Board would be unable to make arrangements of that kind. The Board has a considerable number of schools under its minimum-salary regulations—seven or eight.

321. The Board grants a capitation grant to these schools having an attendance of 7 or 8 of £4 a head?—Yes.

322. Under the suggested scale you notice the grant would be £5 per head?—Yes.

323. That would, of course, be more liberal than at present provided by the Southland Board?—Yes; but I think in these cases we require the inhabitants of the districts to subsidise the salaries up to £50.

324. Yes; but in this suggested scale there would be nothing to prevent the Board from carrying on that principle, for instead of £4 a head they would get £5, and the inhabitants would pay a smaller amount to make up the difference: would that not be so?—I think the spirit of the Board would be that, the department having taken the matter out of their hands, they would not be obliged to make provision of that kind.

325. Would not the Government make a provision for them?—Yes, but it is not provided in the present scale; the Board's powers are elastic, and they very often can, by arrangement and expediency, provide for the education of children in these out-of-the-way places, whereas a hard-and-fast scale would prevent them.

326. If there are thirteen different scales, and the conditions vary in certain districts, the salaries paid will be very much smaller than those paid in more fortunate districts, will they not?—Yes.

327. Then, is it not the tendency for the best class of teachers to gravitate towards the districts where the best salaries are paid: is it not the natural tendency?—Experience shows us that the salaries paid in Southland are between the lowest and the highest—the mean—and the teachers are about the best we can get; therefore it does not appear that the teachers have gravitated, since in our district we have a very fine class of teachers. I do not know a single teacher in this district to whom I would be unwilling to intrust the education of my own children. I have a statement here prepared in connection with the sewing-mistress question. The Board was considering the question, and this statement was prepared by the treasurer, showing the effect of the income and expenditure, and that we could not afford to pay anything for sewing-mistresses. The statement applies to schools with male teachers only:—

GROUP No. 1 (35 to 44).

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Income—576 pupils at £3 15s.				2,160	0	0
Expenditure—Fifteen schools—						
Teachers' salaries	2,140	8	0			
School Fund	185	3	6			
Administration (5s. per pupil)	144	0	0			
				2,469	11	6
Loss on working				309	11	6

Average loss per school, £20 12s.

GROUP No. 2 (25 to 34).

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Income—651 pupils at £3 15s.				2,441	5	0
Expenditure—Twenty-two schools—						
Teachers' salaries	2,961	0	0			
School Fund	237	13	6			
Administration (5s. per pupil)	162	15	0			
				3,361	8	6
Loss on working				920	3	6

Average loss per school, £41 16s.

COST OF APPOINTING SEWING-TEACHERS.

	£	s.	d.
Group No. 1—Fifteen schools at £5	75	0	0
Group No. 2—Twenty-two schools at £5	110	0	0
	185	0	0

By this you will see that the loss is recouped through the large schools, and we have only three large schools in Invercargill—in fact, we have only two, the Middle and the South Schools, with attendances from 600 to 650. In Dunedin they probably have seven or eight schools with attendances of from 600 to 700, and in Wellington the same. In districts like Otago and Wellington—centralised districts—they have large sums of money for the schools; but in a scattered district like this we have not the funds, and we have not the advantages or opportunities. Our practice is to appoint a pupil-teacher at 45. The reason why we have such a large number of female teachers is that where a school with a male head-teacher arrives at the point at which to receive a pupil-teacher we are obliged to appoint a female pupil-teacher in order to teach sewing. The Board has always had splendid material for every application for female pupil-teachers. We have very often had thirteen, fourteen, or fifteen applications from girls who have already passed examinations and are somewhat experienced.

328. On the average, your opinion is that the members of your teaching staff are as highly qualified as the staff of probably any district in New Zealand?—Yes.

329. Do you think it is fair that a male or female teacher in the Southland District who is equally qualified, and is doing quite as efficient work, should receive a lower salary than a male or female teacher similarly situated in any other district in New Zealand?—I would not like to say that, because in other professions you have the same disparity. Life is better in Canterbury or Wellington, where the conditions of life are such that a man might fairly concede something in salary in order to derive those advantages; in a district like this the soil, climate, and other conditions are not so favourable.

330. Then, do you mean that the teachers in such districts should be paid higher salaries?—I would not say so.

331. Do you not think that your teachers are as deserving of as high salaries as obtain in other districts?—Yes.

332. You are aware that they are not paid as high as in some other districts?—Yes.

333. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] With regard to these aided schools, do you ask the residents to assist you in connection with them?—Yes; in some cases where the attendance is so low that the Board is not justified in maintaining them unaided.

334. Do you mean in regard to schools where the attendance has gone down through some cause or another, or in the case of schools originally established?—Schools in which the attendance has gone down.

335. To what amount do you make the salaries up to?—It depends upon the teacher employed. If the teacher is uncertificated, or holds a very low certificate, then only a small amount; but if the place is very far removed we endeavour to make it up to the ordinary minimum salary—from £50 to £70, I should say.

336. £70 to males and £50 to females?—In nearly all cases the positions are filled by females.

337. Is it not very difficult to get female teachers to fill the positions in these out-of-the-way places?—Of course, that is a point we take into consideration when making appointments.

338. Are there residences for most of your teachers?—In nearly all cases; there are a few exceptions, principally in schools with an attendance of 20 downwards; from 23 upwards there are residences.

339. Do you establish a School Committee for each school?—Yes, when the districts are divided into school districts.

340. Have you residences for your caretakers?—I am not aware of any.

341. *Mr. Weston.*] As a matter of fact, is it not so that educational matters are not tasteful to the majority of people?—I would not admit that.

342. Do not but a moderate number of people care to take part in the matter of the administration of educational matters in the colony?—With regard to the higher governing bodies, I think what you say is correct. Sometimes our householders' meetings lapse, and there is a reluctance on the part of some to take part.

343. If we have a colonial scale of staff and salaries, and the higher powers are taken from the Boards, do you think it will act as a deterrent to those who are even now prepared to take charge of education matters?—I think, the more you take the powers from Education Boards the more reluctant people will be to take part in the functions of Boards; it is a great sacrifice now on the part of many to devote their time and energies, and if you restrict their powers they will not feel disposed to act.

344. With regard to incidental expenses, do you find that the amounts allotted to the Committees by your Board are accepted as sufficient by the Committees?—When I became a member of the Board four years ago I prepared a statement of the amounts paid to Committees with a view of showing the percentage, and I forwarded a copy of it to each secretary of a Board for confirmation. I have a copy of it with me, which I will be pleased to place before the Commission. This statement had the effect of proving that the Southland grant was lower than in any other district, with one or two exceptions. In this district we require a large grant, especially when taking into consideration the repairs to school-buildings, and painting, and things of that sort, necessary on account of the climate. I had the Southland grant increased, and I find that now in most cases there is a small credit balance at the end of the year.

345. Is not the allowance to Committees supplemented by entertainments, subscriptions, and concerts?—Yes; every School Committee has entertainments and concerts, and so forth, during the course of the year, in order to supplement their allowance.

346. So far as I know, there is no power to compel the public to subscribe, is there?—No.

347. Then, as that is so, supposing they did not subscribe, and the incidental allowance proved insufficient, what must be the result as regards the property of the Board and the interests of the children?—As to the concluding part of your question, they would be neglected; but it is not our

experience in the South that such would be the case; we are Scotch people to a large extent, and very hospitable and kindly.

348. Is it not a fact that one can but arrive at the conclusion that if the allowances to School Committees are insufficient, and they are unable to supplement them, the schools must suffer, the property of the Board deteriorate, and the interests of the children to some extent be sacrificed? —That would be natural.

349. *Mr. Hogben.*] You expressed the opinion that if power was taken from the Boards many of the best men on the Boards would no longer feel disposed to give their services in that respect? —I think I hardly went so far as to say that; what I meant was that that would be the tendency on the part of members. It is urged that School Committees do not take an interest in matters if you take away their powers, and the same applies to Boards. No doubt a great many self-sacrificing men would still continue to take an interest in matters connected with the Boards.

350. Are you aware that in connection with this suggestion it has been set forth in evidence to the Commission by myself that there is no desire to take away the powers of Education Boards? —My impression is that the adoption of a colonial scale would be to take away the power, in not giving Boards the money to allocate that they previously had.

351. It would give them the money—more money for their own expenses than they have now, would it not?—Yes; I understand generally it does so.

352. Would not the only way in which the power of the Boards would be interfered with be by saying that so much must be spent in such a way in connection with salaries?—Yes.

353. Then, do you think that would seriously affect the administrative powers of Boards?—If you take away from the Boards the power of dealing with matters in the elastic way to which I referred, it would.

354. The only way in which that discretionary power could be exercised at all, other than under a colonial scale, would be by altering teachers' salaries, would it not?—Yes.

355. Of schools with an average attendance under 9 you have one, I think?—I think there are two. I estimate that from the last available report—1899.

356. You have six with an average of 12—that is, in the aggregate, 72 pupils?—Yes.

357. Could you tell me what your Board spent in salaries in connection with those schools altogether?—I could give you the particulars to the end of December, 1899. There is a school at Mimihau, with an attendance of 8: the salary paid is £70.

358. I mean the total amount spent in the seven schools?—It would take some little time to compute.

359. What is your impression as to what the average would be?—For a school of 8, say, £50 for a female teacher.

360. Would the Board pay £50?—The Board would pay a capitation of £4 per pupil.

361. Then, you would make the residents make up the deficiency?—Yes, under some circumstances.

362. You only pay £4 a pupil?—Yes.

363. It seems to me you are placing too much weight on schools of which you have only a small number: could not your difficulty be got over by a regulation for a minimum salary?—If some measure of elasticity could be given to the Boards by a special provision, I think so.

364. Have you taken the amount your district would receive for salaries and for the Board's expenses under the proposed scheme set before the Commission?—I expected to get that information from the secretary.

365. You are not in a position to express any opinion as to whether you think the Board could, even with the increased capitation up to £4—an increase of 5s. a head—pay these salaries?—I have not gone into the question.

366. You are not surprised to hear the Board could not do it?—It is very possible. There are some grave anomalies in the scale, especially in the case of teachers who have to pay £10 a year to a sewing-mistress. Out of thirty-seven cases, in ten it might be satisfactory; but in the other twenty-seven it would be a case of an "Irish" rise.

367. You mean if a teacher was unmarried?—Yes.

368. Then, his expenses would be less if he was single?—I would not say anything on that point.

369. *The Chairman.*] Have you seen the alternative scale?—Yes.

370. *Mr. Hogben.*] Might I ask whether your answers and statements apply to the first suggested scale?—Yes.

371. You object to a colonial scale on account of its want of elasticity?—Yes.

372. You agree that one of your objections—as to the small schools—might be removed by a modification of the scale?—Yes; I still think there are some cases where the Board should be allowed to exercise discretionary power.

THURSDAY, 23RD MAY, 1901.

JAMES HENDRY, Inspector of Schools, Southland Education Board, examined.

Mr. Hendry: The ground has been already covered by previous witnesses, and in order to avoid a duplication of the evidence tendered, and the burdening of the Commission with unnecessary evidence, I will, with your permission, simply subject myself to examination.

373. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you think a colonial scale of staff and salaries desirable?—Yes.

374. Is it within your knowledge that a great deal of dissatisfaction and unrest among teachers throughout New Zealand exists in regard to the salaries at present paid?—Yes, that is my conviction.

375. You think it is desirable that, in addition to a uniform scale of staffing the schools of the colony, there should be uniformity in the salaries paid to the teachers?—Yes.

376. Have you seen No. 2 of the proposed colonial scales?—I have it in my hand.

377. You notice that it differs somewhat in the scale of staffing from No. 1?—Yes.

378. The first point of difference is in the grade 35 to 75, which is altered from that to 40 to 90: is that a change for the better?—In my opinion it is a change for the better. I think, at 40 it is better to make the appointment after the headmaster.

379. Do you think the first assistance in a school of that kind should take the form of a mistress as against a pupil-teacher?—Emphatically; I hold the opinion that every child in the country is entitled to the services of a fully qualified teacher.

380. The admission of a pupil-teacher at 90, in addition to the headmaster and mistress, also meets with your approval?—Yes; we find that the schools of from 90 to 110 are probably the hardest class of schools to work.

381. What is the average attendance of the two largest schools in Invercargill?—Speaking without the book, I should say from 580 to 650.

382. One comes within the grade of from 570 to 600?—Yes.

383. Will you tell the Commission the present staffing of that school?—A headmaster, mistress, four assistants, and I am not prepared to say how many pupil-teachers—I think, seven.

384. In the suggested scale the staffing allowed is a headmaster, an infant mistress, six assistants, and six pupil-teachers: in your opinion, is that staffing more efficient than you have obtaining now?—Yes, I think so; it would lead to smaller classes, and would necessarily imply more individual attention to each child.

385. The same statement would apply to other schools with large classes?—Yes.

386. In the interests of education, you think it would be advisable that there should be a uniform scale of staff and salaries rather than thirteen different scales?—Emphatically so.

387. *Mr. Stewart.*] You are in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

388. There have been other proposals put forward, such as a differential capitation, and so forth: do you think, if such a proposal were carried out, that it would have any effect on the anomalies which exist in the different scales of payment?—I think it would lessen them; not remove them entirely.

389. Do you think it would be a wise thing to go still further and pay higher capitation without making any uniformity in the scale for the payment of teachers?—I do not think so.

390. Do you think it would be possible, so long as there are thirteen scales of payment throughout the colony, to establish any contributing scheme of insurance or superannuation?—I hardly think so. I have not given very much thought to the question of a superannuation scheme.

391. If only one scale obtained throughout the colony, would it not be easier and better to establish a superannuation scheme than as at present with the existence of thirteen different scales?—Yes, that appears to me to be clear.

392. Would it not be far easier to say what deductations should be made from the salaries of teachers throughout the colony if there was a uniform scale?—Yes.

393. Do you think that the feeling of unrest among the teachers, to which you gave answer, is having an injurious effect on the teachers?—I believe there is dissatisfaction.

394. Do you think it has an injurious effect on the numbers who apply to enter the profession?—So far as the males are concerned, I should say Yes.

395. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you think it would be in the interests of education to combine some of the smaller education districts into one large district?—I am hardly prepared to express an opinion upon that matter.

396. For instance, could the Otago Education District be amalgamated with the Southland District, or could the Grey and Westland Districts be amalgamated?—So far as the amalgamation of Otago and Southland is concerned, I hardly think so; the district would be an exceedingly wide one, and would cover an immense amount of country. Another thing is that I think the Southland Board has a very much more intimate knowledge of local circumstances than the Otago Board would be likely to have.

397. You experience a difficulty in getting male candidates to apply for positions of teachers under your Board?—Yes.

398. You have no difficulty in getting female candidates?—No; there is an ample supply.

399. Do you believe in the principle of equal pay for equal work—that female teachers should be paid the same salaries as male teachers all through?—I am not prepared to give an answer to that question.

400. *Mr. Hill.*] What is your opinion about the centralisation of the inspectorate?—I have no very strong opinion on the matter.

401. Do you think it would be beneficial to the work of education that Inspectors should be placed under the central department?—I believe, possibly there would be a beneficial tendency.

402. Do you think education would be improved all round?—I believe so.

403. You have read over the suggested scale as recommended by the Secretary of the Education Department?—Yes.

404. Have you noticed the classification there proposed?—Yes.

405. Do you approve of the classification?—Yes.

406. You approve of the principle, and believe that a teacher, say, in a school of 600 should be classified as B1?—I do not quite understand to what you are referring.

407. The original scale: are you prepared to approve of the classification as suggested in that table?—I should be inclined to modify it in certain particulars.

408. Do you think it necessary, even in the interests of education, to insist that a B1 classification should be required?—No, I do not.

409. What is the highest certificate you suggest should be adopted in a general scheme of education?—C1.

410. Do you think it is not possible to find a head-teacher with an E1 classification capable of taking charge of a large school?—I think it is possible.

411. Do you think a teacher should be debarred in any way whatever simply because he has not been able to pass the special examination required?—I do not know that it necessarily follows that an E1 teacher is unable to pass the examination; possibly he has never presented himself for examination.

412. Are you prepared to say that the subjects required for the C1 examination are the best possible for the community?—The subjects required for the C1 are various.

413. Are they the best that can be selected for the benefit of the community and for the position of a master who has to teach the children of the public?—Yes, I think so.

414. Are not the subjects and the demands of the public constantly varying?—Yes, to some extent.

415. A man who possesses a C1 or a B1 certificate may not be prepared in future years to supply the needs of the public?—Yes, but the possession of those certificates is evidence of a general education.

416. Might not a man possess that evidence and possess the knowledge without the passing of a special kind of examination?—Yes.

417. Do you not think that your teachers are constantly preparing themselves for their positions as teachers?—We hope so.

418. Is it not necessary that they should adapt themselves to their environment?—We find that they do.

419. Are they prepared, as they get old, to present themselves for these specialised examinations, or are they as well prepared as the younger teachers?—Probably not; as a matter of fact, we find that teachers do try to present themselves for the higher examinations.

420. Is not the knowledge they are obtaining through their experience very valuable to the children?—Yes, emphatically so.

421. Then, they are becoming very useful?—Yes, necessarily so.

422. And yet they still have low certificates?—Very few.

423. Though a number possess those low certificates, they have special qualification in the matter of skill?—Yes.

424. Would you debar them from obtaining any higher position, although they have wide knowledge, experience, and technical skill?—I do not understand that they are debarred.

425. A man with an E1 classification has no chance against a man with a C1 in the matter of an appointment?—Probably not.

426. There are a vast number of teachers in New Zealand, all highly skilled men, who may not possess a certificate required according to this scale?—Yes.

427. Then, the moment a scale like this, with the same classification, becomes an official document, what will School Committees naturally demand from candidates when vacancies occur?—Probably School Committees will demand from teachers the classification set down opposite their position.

428. Supposing that you had a teacher in your school, assuming that you had one, who did not possess the necessary qualification, what would you demand?—It does not warrant me in saying that that would demand the dismissal of that particular teacher.

429. Do you think there would be a great deal of trouble?—No.

430. Do you think the School Committee would demand that a change should be made in the staff of the school?—I am not prepared to say so.

431. You do not think a change would be demanded by the School Committee?—I do not think so, as long as the teacher is doing faithful and satisfactory work.

432. *Mr. Hogben.*] You expressed an opinion that it would not be a benefit to the cause of education that the Southland District should be amalgamated with the Otago District?—Yes.

433. Is your objection to that based on the feeling you have that it would be really a step in direction of the centralisation?—Yes, that is so.

434. And that the knowledge that would be possessed at Dunedin of the particular wants of a district in Southland would not necessarily be much greater than that possessed by the central department?—Yes, that is so.

435. What is your opinion with regard to the appointment of teachers: do you or do you not think that it is best to leave those powers in the hands of the Boards?—Yes, the power is best left in the hands of Boards.

436. With regard to deductions in the case of certificates to which reference has been made, you observed that it is not to make the appointment for a certain certificate exclusive: it does not exclude teachers?—No, I understand that.

437. I presume you take the letter of the certificate to be evidence of the possession of a certain amount of culture of mind?—Yes.

438. So that, whatever the subjects may be, the holder of the certificate has passed through certain mental discipline?—Yes, mental gymnastics.

439. That is evidence of the discipline?—Yes.

440. In cases like the appointment of teachers the one object of the certificates is that there should be evidence of such discipline?—Yes.

441. Do you think that a man who has already gone through such discipline is more or less likely to go on with studies than a man who has not?—Yes, more likely, certainly.

442. Other things being equal, the possession of a reasonably high certificate would be in the favour of a candidate for a vacancy?—Yes, I should imagine so.

443. In appointments now the possession of high certificates, other things being equal, such as length of experience and amount of skill, give candidates a better chance of appointment, I presume?—Yes, that is so; in deciding any appointment in this district, at all events.

444. Would you prefer to see, if the financial conditions would allow of it, the deductions on certificates removed from the scale?—I should.

445. As to the limit at which a school shall cease to be in charge of a sole teacher, what form, in your opinion, should the first assistance given to the master assume?—The first assistance should be in the form of a fully qualified teacher, not a pupil-teacher.

446. What is your opinion as to the limit, if the financial conditions permit of it, at which an assistant should be introduced?—At 45, conditionally upon some relief being afforded to the unaided teacher. We find the class of schools from 35 to 45 the hardest class of school to work single-handed.

447. You would go as far as 45 if the financial conditions allowed the introduction of a teacher at 40?—I should prefer 40 myself.

448. Quite apart from the syllabus, if you had children from five to fifteen years of age, would it be possible to divide them into fewer than five or six classes in a school beyond 40—say, 45?—There would be the usual standard classes and two or three preparatory classes.

449. About eight classes?—There might be eight or nine classes.

450. With the utmost grouping—you could not take more than two years together, for the children would be of different mental capacity—you would not be able to reduce them to less than five or six classes?—No.

451. Do you think, or do you not think, with five or six classes, and an average attendance between 40 and 45, the tension on the teacher and the consequent diminution of individual attention the children would receive would be so great as to warrant going back to 40 as the limit?—I prefer 40, and I suggest a lightening of the syllabus.

452. Even with the lightening of the syllabus the ages of the children and their corresponding mental capacity would imply a corresponding number of classes?—Yes.

453. If you had an ideal staff, where would you put the first assistance after the master and mistress—at what number?—At 90 I should certainly give the next assistance.

454. Would you put the limit at 80?—No, I am not prepared to say so. We find that schools up to that attendance can be very well worked by two teachers.

455. An average attendance of 90 would mean at times an attendance of over 100?—Yes.

456. Considering that point you would fix 90?—Yes.

457. If you raised the number to 90, at which you would give the assistance in the form of a pupil-teacher, you presuppose that the syllabus is still lighter than it would be for a school with a larger number of assistants?—I do not think the lightening would be necessary.

458. When you say that the first help after a master should take the form of an assistant, do you mean an assistant with some experience, or just a mere pupil-teacher?—An assistant with experience.

459. What do you think should be the minimum salary paid, taking everything into consideration?—£100.

460. *The Chairman.*] Generally speaking, do you think the schools in this district are sufficiently staffed?—No; I think that certain classes of schools are insufficiently staffed.

461. I mean, speaking generally?—Generally speaking, the staffing is fairly adequate, except in one or two cases, where, in my opinion, it is insufficient.

462. Are you satisfied with the quality of the teachers you have in this district?—The teachers do very good work in this district.

463. The system of primary education is efficient?—Yes.

464. Is it capable of improvement?—Yes, possibly; all things are capable of improvement.

465. Supposing there was a large expenditure on the schools and an improvement in the matter of staffing, would it tend to an all-round increase of efficiency in the teaching carried on in the schools?—With a greater expenditure and a larger staff I should imagine that an all-round rising in efficiency would follow.

466. Would the teachers be more efficient than those you have at the present time?—No, but they would be able to work more efficiently if the staffing was enlarged.

467. Your opinion is that the staffing at the present time is not sufficiently good?—In certain classes.

468. In the majority?—It is fairly adequate in the majority.

469. When vacancies occur, have you any great difficulty in getting teachers?—Not with regard to pupil-teachers.

470. I mean of any rank?—I should say we have a fair supply—a good supply.

471. You have a good supply of material?—Yes.

472. You say there is a good deal of dissatisfaction among the teachers: does that apply only to your own district, or throughout the colony?—It applies generally, I think, to the colony. There is certainly dissatisfaction in this district, because there are not ordinary chances of promotion. There are only the two large schools, and the teachers as a body feel that they are excluded from promotion.

473. Do you think the teachers labour under a delusion that they are not sufficiently remunerated?—I am not prepared to say what is their opinion in that matter.

474. Have they made complaints to you?—Not within my recollection. They may have done so.

475. The dissatisfaction, in your opinion, is chiefly due to the fact that they have no reasonable prospect of promotion in this district owing to the absence of large schools?—Yes; such dissatisfaction as I have heard given expression to.

476. Have you lost many of your best teachers through their going to other districts?—No, we have not.

477. They remain here?—Yes; some of our best teachers have endeavoured to leave the district for more extensive districts.

478. It has been suggested to you that a colonial scale of staff and salaries would remove many of the anomalies: do you think it would effectively remove all anomalies?—Probably not.

479. Take, for instance, the anomaly of giving a first assistant only half the salary paid to a headmaster in a large school, and not giving him even house allowance: do you think a colonial scale would be apt to remove that?—The colonial scale before us does not remove that.

480. Do you think that teachers would be better treated under the central department than under Boards?—I am inclined to think that they would not. I think the teachers as a body prefer to remain under the Boards.

481. In that case, do you think it would be advisable for the Boards to confer and arrange upon some system of salaries, instead of leaving it to the central department?—I am inclined to think that a uniform scale could be properly administered.

482. If a scale of salaries should be determined by the central department, what would you do in regard to incidental expenses?—Matters of finance are outside my province, and I am not prepared to give an opinion.

483. Are you aware whether the Committees are satisfied with the amounts they receive for incidental expenses?—No, they never are.

484. Is there any uniformity about paying them?—I believe there are as many different modes of paying Committees as there are districts.

485. Is it not desirable that there should be uniformity in regard to Committees' allowances, just in the same manner as paying salaries?—Possibly.

486. If you established a uniform system in both cases, would you not go a little further and have a uniform system of payment to the Boards for their expenses: the expense of carrying on their operations, their administration, such as the payment of clerks' salaries, Inspectors' salaries, staff, and so forth?—You would find it difficult in getting members to serve on the Boards, I am inclined to think. They would feel, rightly or wrongly, that their functions were being interfered with; it might upset the constitution of the Boards.

487. Do you not think, if the privilege of staffing schools and determining the salaries of the teachers was taken away from Boards, that you would find some difficulty in getting the members of Boards to serve?—I think not.

488. Would that not be a deprivation of their powers?—I do not think so. The feeling or opinion I have given expression to is the feeling of many members of Boards, I am aware. Personally, it is not mine.

489. Do you think you would get men of the same quality to serve on the Boards?—Yes.

490. Even if the question of the payment of teachers' salaries was effectually removed beyond their control?—Yes.

491. You have been asked whether the establishment of a colonial scale of staff and salaries was essential to the creation of a pension fund; do you think it is necessary?—I said: I had not given the matter much consideration.

492. Do you think a pension scheme is desirable?—Yes, I think it is desirable.

493. A superannuation scheme for aged teachers?—Yes.

494. Would you confine the scheme to teachers simply?—I see no reason why it should not extend to Inspectors also.

495. And secretaries?—Yes.

496. As a large-hearted man, would you not give it to every profession?—Yes.

497. To be generalised throughout the community?—I am not prepared to say that.

498. You have been told that certificates as now proposed would not exclude teachers, and are not intended to exclude teachers; that those certificates of high-class imply culture of mind, or what is called mental gymnastics; do you not think that the prominence supposed to be given to those certificates would prejudically affect a large class of teachers in New Zealand?—Possibly it might to some extent.

499. What would be the effect on the minds of Committeemen generally, owing to the prominence given to those certificates in the matter of appointment of teachers?—I think C1 and B1, as set down, probably too high. I have said—I can only speak for this district—that it would not affect the teachers here, for the Board has the appointment of teachers entirely in its own hands.

500. Do you not think that the public and the majority of members of Boards would endeavour to obtain only men, for the best vacancies, who held those high certificates?—That has not been my experience. There is in charge of one of our larger schools with an attendance probably of about 250, a highly capable teacher who holds a D1 certificate.

501. Is there any reason why men holding D1 certificates should not attain to higher positions?—No.

502. What class of men generally hold those high positions with B and C certificates: are they the strongest or weakest teachers?—In this district they are emphatically strong teachers, so far as my memory serves me.

503. Who are the stronger teachers?—So far as teaching ability is concerned, I am not prepared to discriminate.

504. Is a teacher with a D1 certificate, so far as being a teacher is concerned, just as good as a man holding a B or C certificate?—Yes.

505. Are they young men or men who have had experience who obtain Division 1?—Certainly the men of experience.

506. Do you think the young teachers have not been afforded a chance to obtain higher certificates?—No.

507. Efficiency and experience in the securing of teachers do not necessarily go hand-in-hand?—Not necessarily; young teachers secure certificates and they acquire their experience afterwards.

W. Macalister, Member of the Southland Education Board, examined.

Mr. Macalister: I have looked into the proposed scale of staffing and salaries, and, generally speaking, I am in favour of it. I am distinctly in favour of a colonial scale. In order to make the system of administering the Education Act complete, I think there ought to have been a colonial system of appointing teachers, and also a colonial system of making grants to Committees, and my reasons for including these, particularly the former of the two, is because I understand that in a number of education districts they are bones of contention between Boards and Committees. The Committees generally have the idea that they ought to appoint the teachers, or that the method of consultation ought to be equivalent to placing the appointment of the teachers in their hands. Of course, members of Boards who know their duties and responsibilities cannot legally accede to that position, and hence a good deal of dissatisfaction exists at times because there is not some recognised system adopted. One Board has one system and another Board another system. If the department adopted a uniform system and made it compulsory that Boards should appoint in accordance with that, and consult Committees in accordance with that, I think a very great deal of good would result. The second matter to which I referred—the allowance made to School Committees—is usually the other bone of contention. The Committees are almost continually complaining that the Boards do not make a sufficient allowance to meet country expenses. Of course, the Boards—our Board, at any rate—the Southland Board—has not been in a position to increase to any very large extent Committee allowances, and I believe, on the whole, that they are inadequate. The Boards cannot help that; but at the same time the Committees seem to look on the Boards as being responsible for the small allowances made to them. I do not consider that the adoption of a colonial scale of staff and salaries would take much power out of the hands of Education Boards. Of course, it depends from what standpoint the matter is viewed. If the Boards consider their chief function is to receive the moneys and disburse them as they think fit, I dare say a great deal of power is taken out of their hands; but I consider this a rather unimportant part—it should be, at any rate—of the duties of Education Boards. At the present time we have in Southland a scale of staff and salaries adopted by our Board, and I suppose every Education Board in the colony has its scale of staff and salaries. The Southland scale of staff and salaries has been in existence thirteen years, and our Board has never attempted to alter it—it has been adhered to strictly. I do not see it would have made any difference to us if that system had been imposed in the first instance on the Board by the department, provided the system was a satisfactory and workable one. There must be a system in existence; and the discretion left to the Board, in the absence of a colonial system, would be to change it at any time. A colonial system would deprive Boards of the power to alter the system at discretion. The Southland Board's system is inferior to the proposed system, and the Southland Board has worked without change for thirteen years. So long as a satisfactory system is found that will work fairly well in all the districts of the colony, and the Boards are asked to staff the schools and pay salaries in accordance with that system, I do not see that the Boards have any grounds for complaint, or that they should look upon it as detracting from their powers in any way whatever. I think, if there is an advantage to be gained throughout the colony and in the interests of education as a whole, that the Boards should gladly welcome a colonial scale of staff and salaries, and I could never understand why we have not had a colonial scale. In this suggested scale, of course, there may be points to which exception can be taken. I believe there is an amended scale brought forward by the Inspector-General, but I have not had time to study it; and I believe some slight alterations, departing from the first suggested scale, have been made in it. On the whole, the present proposed colonial scale, in my opinion at any rate, is a good one, and, speaking as a member of the Southland Board, if there were one or two slight alterations in it I should be very glad indeed if such a system were adopted. As I said, I understand there are some amendments made, but they do not essentially alter the original scale. One or two points occurred to me on looking through it that seemed to commend it to me, and the first one was that it provided for a very substantial increase to country teachers. I think the object to be held in view in increasing the salaries of all country teachers is not simply to give them adequate payment for their services. Apart from the teachers altogether, I think the people living in the country districts and more remote parts are entitled to some such system of paying teachers as will induce the best class of teachers to go there. An objection is raised to that on the ground that the country schoolmasters would be paid higher salaries than are paid to teachers in town schools; but if that is necessary in order to induce the better class of teacher to go into the country, then I say they should be paid at a high rate. There is no doubt about it that the residents in the country districts are entitled to share to the fullest extent in the benefits of our education system. Another point in the scale that commended it to me was the increase in the staffing of the schools, and I think that will be gladly welcomed. In one particular, though, it seemed to me to somewhat overdo it, but I believe that has been altered by the amended scale. I refer to giving an assistant when the average attendance reaches 36. In my opinion that is unnecessary. I see in the amended scale that it is altered to 41, and I approve of that, for I am of the opinion that when the attendance reaches over 40 the teacher ought to be assisted. I also think that the methods set forth in the scale of adopting assistant teachers instead of pupil-teachers is a very good one. I do not think that the head-teacher in charge of a school of 40 pupils should be nominally assisted by a pupil-teacher, who in reality is very often rather a burden. I suppose the more liberal the method is of staffing the

schools, assuming that only a limited amount of money is available, the less will be the salaries paid. I consider that, in order to secure real efficiency in our schools, the main point to be attended to is to raise the salaries not only up to the living-wage, but to pay such salaries as will induce the very best talent to enter upon the teaching profession. Even if the amount of money expended on education now were increased by one-half in the furtherance of this, I think the money would be very well spent. One point I object to, so far as our district is concerned, is the reduction in the salaries of our first assistants, and I think that is a great mistake.

Mr. Hogben: I might point out to the witness that the amount saved by the lessening of the staff as proposed in the alternative scheme will bring the salaries of the assistants, male and female, up to the Otago scale, and a little beyond it, or up to the Canterbury scale slightly, whereas in a few instances that is higher than the Otago scale.

Mr. Macalister: I am very pleased to hear that, and I think that is very satisfactory. It was clearly a mistake to propose to reduce the salaries of the first assistants. We have very few large schools in Southland, and that means there are very few positions sufficient to induce men of real talent to enter the profession; and, of course, many of the teachers must remain assistants and be contented with those positions, which should be looked upon as permanent positions well remunerated. Another point I wish to refer to is the provision made for the alternation of the sexes, but I believe that has been slightly altered too. I think it would be a grave error to oblige Boards to fill the higher positions with either male or female teachers, as a hard-and-fast rule, though I am of the opinion that the higher positions in large schools should undoubtedly be filled by males. Another good feature of the scale that struck me was the proposed reduction in the number of pupil-teachers and the increase of assistants. I do not approve of the provision to pay pupil-teachers, boys and girls, equal salaries. That is a mistake. The scale should offer every inducement for boys to enter the profession. In fact, the more men—I mean, of course, men of the right stamp—we can get in the teaching profession the better for education, not only education in the narrow sense of the term, but education in the broad sense. We find in Southland that when vacancies for pupil-teachers are advertised we receive a very large number of applications, but that frequently very very few of the applications are from boys. We have adopted the rule that if the boys were found suitable they should be given preference over the girls, and this has been done because our Board recognises the fact that there are too few male teachers entering the profession. To induce a desirable number of them to enter the profession, fairly high salaries should be offered. Again, a reduction of the salaries paid to male assistants will deter very many of the boys from entering the profession, for it would mean that before they would be able to get anything good and suitable in the way of salary they would have to rise to the position of headmaster. I notice in the scale—and it has been referred to by previous witnesses—that there is no provision made for sick-leave. Some provision should be made for that, for at the very best the salaries proposed to be paid according to the scale are not very much above the mean. Another matter that I have no doubt comes within the order of reference is that there should be some provision made for the training of our teachers, and some better system of training our pupil-teachers. The system adopted in Southland, and also, I believe, in other districts, is to appoint a boy or girl—we give preference to the boys—who has passed the Sixth Standard. He or she is then considered fit to become a pupil-teacher, or an apprentice. I consider that a huge mistake. I consider that boys and girls becoming pupil-teachers should have most of their study behind them before they are appointed. For that reason I think provision should be made that intending teachers should get a thoroughly efficient training not only in the primary schools, but in the high schools. If the boy or girl has passed through a high school, passes the Matriculation Examination, and then becomes a pupil-teacher, the study of methods of teaching and subjects particularly connected with his or her own profession is all that should be expected from them. The preparation of ordinary subjects, such as Euclid, algebra, mathematics, French, and Latin, I think a pupil-teacher should have behind him before he enters the profession at all.

508. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You have had considerable experience as a teacher?—Yes; I have had about twelve years' experience in the primary schools and in the High School.

509. You are a member of the Education Board?—Yes; and have been for five years.

510. You have been Chairman of the Board?—Yes.

511. Do you consider that the teachers in Southland as a whole are inadequately paid for the work they do under your existing scale?—As a whole, they are inadequately paid.

512. You stated that you are in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

513. You are no doubt aware of the anomalies that exist in the various education districts with regard to the staffing of schools and the paying of salaries?—Yes.

514. Do you think a colonial scale would do away with those anomalies?—Yes.

515. In the matter of pupil-teachers your Board gives preference to males over females?—Yes.

516. That practice has not been in existence very long in Southland, has it?—It practically came into existence after I became a member of the Board.

517. Is it not a fact that until quite recently preference was given to females, so that they would be able to teach sewing?—No, I would not say that.

518. How do you account for the large number of female pupil-teachers in the service of the Board?—Because in so many instances only females apply for the positions. I believe in some cases, in deference to the wishes of the Committee, and in order to provide for the teaching of sewing, females have been appointed to positions in country schools.

519. On the recommendation of the headmaster?—Our Board never appoint on the recommendation of the headmaster. If the headmaster makes a recommendation, of course it is considered, but an appointment will not be made solely on his recommendation.

520. With regard to the number of pupils a sole teacher can efficiently teach in Southland, according to the rules and regulations of the Education Board, is not a teacher required to teach 45 on an average without assistance?—Yes, I believe so.

521. You are of opinion that the form of assistance should be an assistant rather than pupil-teachers?—Yes.

522. You consider there are too many pupil-teachers in the service of the Board: do you think it would be better to appoint one assistant in the large schools instead of two pupil-teachers?—I could not say that.

523. With regard to this much-discussed topic of equal pay for equal work, do you consider that a female teacher can teach and control a small country school up to a certain average attendance just as efficiently as a male?—It depends upon what you mean by "efficiently." If you mean the word to include only the passing of the ordinary standards, and securing from the Inspector a satisfactory report, I dare say that in many cases female teachers can.

524. Would you be in favour of giving her the same remuneration as a male?—That, of course, is a particular case. I may say I am not in favour, in the case of teachers, of paying equal pay for equal work, as it is called, because I do not think, in an ordinary school, a woman can do work equal to the work done by a man.

525. Then, the Inspectors' reports on the efficiency of schools taught by female teachers practically go for nothing?—I suppose that the Inspectors are in some cases almost compelled to take perhaps a narrow view; they must report on what they see; they examine in the different subjects, and if they find that a school taught by a female teacher has passed a good examination they report accordingly. Taking a wider view of education and including not only results to be obtained by examination, but the general effect of teaching on the character of the pupils, I consider, always assuming that we have the right stamp of men, that a man in a school can do far more valuable work than a woman.

526. Seeing that you are not in favour of equal pay to the female teachers, are you in favour of minimising the disparity or the difference in the salaries paid to males and females by, say, 10 per cent.?—I think that the disparity of 10 per cent., if my view is correct, is too little. We should make the difference sufficient to induce the males to enter the profession in preference to the females.

527. Do you consider the remuneration given to pupil-teachers, or proposed to be given, under the suggested scale is adequate?—Yes; if I am not mistaken, it is very near our own scale.

528. But you consider that it is adequate?—Of course, there is an addition of £10. I would remark that the disparity is not great when the additional allowances of £10 and £5 are taken into account. I consider that the scale provided here is, on the whole, a fair one.

529. Are you in favour of facilitating the transfer or promotion of teachers as much as possible within the same education district?—Yes, I am in favour of that.

530. Does your Board consult the Committees in making transfers?—Yes. In fact, the Southland Board does not effect a transfer, or exchange I suppose you mean, unless the Committees of the two schools interested consent.

531. You are aware that the transfers could be made without consulting the Committees?—I suppose they could, Yes.

532. *Mr. Weston.*] Do I understand you to say that the transfers could be made without consultation?—It is a legal question, and I have not looked into the Act with a view to answering that question. I would not care to say straight away whether it is so, for it depends on the construction of the Act.

533. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to teachers who have been a number of years in the service of the Board, who have grown old, and for whom no provision is made, would you be in favour of a retiring-allowance or superannuation scheme?—Yes.

534. In order to secure uniformity in the examinations by Inspectors, and the assignment of marks for teachers' efficiency, would you favour the centralisation of the Inspectors—that is, their being placed under the control of the central department?—I think the uniformity desired could be secured in another way, and, that being so, I am strongly opposed to the centralisation of the Inspectors.

535. Did you not say you thought it would be better if the teachers were appointed and paid by the central department?—No, I did not.

536. You said a scheme should be laid down by the department?—Yes; that a scheme should be provided by the department, but that the appointments should be brought about, as far as possible, by the joint acquiescence or agreement of the Boards and Committees.

537. Is it not a fact that the Boards select their nominees, state such selections to the Committee, and ask for their objections?—The Board selects the candidate which it thinks best fitted for the position, and sends the applications to the Committee, and asks the Committee's opinion. If the Committee gives acquiescence, as it usually does, the appointment is made; if it does not, the Board asks and expects the Committee to give its reasons; then the actual appointment, in the legal sense, rests with the Board.

538. With regard to the cost of living, would you be in favour of giving increased salaries in localities where the cost of living is exceptionally high, such as Westland?—I am not prepared to give a decided answer to that question. I should say, as I said before, that provision ought to be made by which every part of the colony reaps to the fullest extent the benefits of our educational system. If it is found to be necessary in order that Westland should reap the benefits of the system to the fullest extent, then I should say, if such a thing were feasible, it should be done.

539. Are residences provided for head-teachers in nearly all the Southland schools?—Yes, nearly all.

540. I suppose where there are not residences house allowance is granted?—Not in all cases; I believe, in the whole of our district there are now only four cases where house allowance is made.

541. With regard to the work of town and country schools, would you be in favour of differentiating between the work expected to be done in a country school where a teacher was unaided

and that of a large town school fully staffed?—I think that the same syllabus should obtain in all our schools, and the question of what allowance should be made for a particular school should be left to the discretion of the Inspector.

542. You think, on the whole, that the adoption of a scheme something akin to the suggested scale of staff and salaries would be beneficial to the teachers in Southland?—I think that the adoption of a colonial scale would be beneficial to the colony as a whole.

543. *Mr. Stewart.*] It has been suggested that in the place of a colonial scale of staff and salaries it might be wise to allow the Education Boards to meet and arrange a staff of scale and salaries among themselves: do you think that would be a satisfactory solution of the difficulty?—One would require to know the result of that particular conference before he could answer that question. I am doubtful as to whether the result would be satisfactory.

544. Do you think the Boards would be as likely to arrange a satisfactory colonial scale as a Commission set up to deal with the question of education, and on which all classes are represented?—I think not.

545. *Mr. Hill.*] You are aware, I suppose, that a woman has to do the same kind of work as a man in order to prepare herself for her examinations?—That is so.

546. She would have to spend as much time in preparation in order to gain her certificates?—Yes.

547. You are also aware that an Inspector requires the same results from female teachers as from male teachers?—Yes.

548. Then, do I understand you to mean that, taking all those conditions into consideration, you would, in the cases of a male and a female, each in charge of a small school with an average attendance of about 30, differentiate the salaries paid?—I think there should be unequal pay, because the conditions you mention as to the preparation required, the examinations to be passed, and the certificates to be gained do not affect the position at all. The question is not what the woman has to do to prepare herself for the position, but what are the general results obtained in the school—not the particular results as to passing examinations. If it is found that the general results obtained by male teachers—again assuming them to be men of the right stamp—are better than the results obtained by female teachers, then undoubtedly the male teachers should receive the higher salaries.

549. You have a high school in this district?—Yes.

550. Have you a high school for young ladies?—The Boys' and Girls' High School is together under one headmaster.

551. Have you any female teachers?—We have.

552. Are they required to do similar work to males?—The arrangement in the High School here is that the higher subjects are taught on the boys' side of the school—for instance, science, higher mathematics, and classics. I wish it to be clear that in answering your question as to equal pay for males and females I am not viewing the mere results of passing examinations. I think the view I take is much clearer when you refer to a high school. I should say, even in a girls' high school a headmaster of the right stamp will get far better results, and the real benefits will be much greater than if taught by a mistress: my experience leads me to say that.

553. Do you not think that a woman of the right stamp would also influence exactly in the same way, and even more so than a man?—I am speaking generally; of course, there are women of the right stamp, just in the same way as there are men.

554. What is your opinion as to the influence female teachers exercise in country schools?—I dare say that female teachers in country schools exercise very good influence.

555. You think that if females were employed they would exercise greater influence?—I consider that where the question of character and discipline is involved, as in training the young, the influence of man is much superior to the influence of woman.

556. This country is more influenced by women than by men, you think?—That is a matter of opinion; woman's influence may be increasing.

557. May it not be possible to increase it more?—It may.

558. You disapprove of the idea to pay women the same salary as men for the same class of work, identical work?—I do not say that. If the work is the same, certainly the women should receive the same salary; but I say the work is not the same. It is not a question simply of the effort; the actual effort put forth by women may be exactly equal to that of men, but that does not entitle them to the same pay. On general grounds we find that the benefits derived by the community, and the children who pass through the schools under the control of competent men, are much greater than the benefits derived by the community, and the children who pass through the schools taught by women—and competent women too. The differentiation of pay ought not to be made for the purpose of marking woman's inferiority, but simply as an inducement for men to enter the profession, and fewer women.

559. Do you not think that boys now seek positions in offices where the chances of promotion are greater, and they are not required to do studies at night: is that not a great inducement to boys?—Yes; but you are travelling outside the real point of the question. Of course, socially, there may be other grounds for urging the employment of women in our schools, and also giving them equal salaries to men. I am viewing the question solely as to what is in the interests of education.

560. Are you also aware that the proposal to pay women lower wages than what are paid to men will eventually mean the lowering of the salaries paid to men?—I have not considered that.

561. *Mr. Hogben.*] Are there not, besides the considerations you have given weight to, other questions in the discussion—social and economic considerations as well?—There may be other reasons in favour of paying equal salaries to women, social and economic reasons, but at the same time I think there are a great many social and economic reasons on the opposite side also.

562. Would not one question that would have to be considered in fixing salaries on any basis of equality be the question as to what the receiver of the wage has to pay out of that wage under the ordinary conditions of society?—Yes; that is a matter that should be taken into consideration.

563. Is it not a matter of common experience that men in the community have to keep, as far as the money goes, a larger proportion of non-wage-earners than women have?—Yes; that is a matter of common experience.

564. It is a phase that would enter the question of equal pay to women?—Yes.

565. When you speak of a colonial system of appointments you refer to the desirability of the adoption of a uniform method by the Boards and Committees in making appointments?—That is so. I do not wish for one moment to suggest that in the matter of appointments any power should be taken out of the hands of Boards and placed in the hands of the department. Personally, I should be strongly opposed to the appointment of teachers by the department, say, in Wellington. What I mean is that there should be a uniform method, and that Boards should appoint the teachers in accordance with that method.

566. When you speak as to the desirability of the department making a uniform rule providing for the method of appointing teachers, would it not be better that a uniform rule should be fixed by legislation a little more rigidly, in preference to the adoption of a method by the Boards in conference?—I am under the impression that by the Act at present in existence the department has power to make regulations for the appointment of teachers. If the Boards could by a conference agree upon a system of appointing teachers, then what I desire would be attained. The objection I have to each Board having the power to adopt its own particular system is that the Committees regard the Board as the author of a scheme restraining their power. My object, therefore, in having a uniform system of appointing teachers is to remove the existing bone of contention between Boards and Committees.

567. With regard to sick-leave, do you not think that the appointment of a sufficient number of relieving-teachers to the several districts, or the allowance to the Boards of sufficient money to enable them to appoint relieving-teachers, would be an advantage?—Assuming that the funds at the disposal of the Boards were sufficient to give sick-leave, I think that would be necessary.

568. If there was a colonial scale approved by this Commission and by the Government, do you not think it would be better, rather than it should rest on the department, that it should have the sanction of Parliament?—I really could not answer that question. So long as a colonial scale of staff and salaries is brought into existence, on the lines of the one suggested, I think the result is one to be desired.

569. *The Chairman.*] Have you any great difficulty in obtaining pupil-teachers now?—We have had some difficulty in obtaining male pupil-teachers, but not females.

570. Does not the difficulty still continue?—Yes, I think so; certainly we have succeeded just recently, a few months past, in obtaining several male pupil-teachers, but I think it more a matter of accident that one or two males applied.

571. Suppose all these positions were filled by male pupil-teachers, what would be the effect?—I do not know that the effect would be a very desirable one; I really could not say what the effect would be.

572. I thought you were of opinion that all positions in the schools would be improved if there were males filling them instead of females?—No, I was speaking generally. There are positions in our schools that must be filled by females; positions in large schools—infant mistresses, for example, and sewing-mistresses: we must have female teachers, and always will have them. In most of the schools where there is a sole teacher in charge it is advisable, if possible, to obtain a male teacher.

573. Besides infant mistresses and sewing-mistresses, what other positions do you think in the large schools could be advantageously filled by females?—In schools where the sexes are separated.

574. I mean in regard to mixed schools?—I do not know, apart from those positions I mentioned—and perhaps the teaching of the lowest standards—that there are any other positions to be advantageously filled by female teachers.

575. Do you think that the teaching of the lower standards can be as efficiently managed by female teachers as by male teachers?—I am not speaking from experience; I should say that in the lower standards the less likelihood there would be for the necessity of appointing male teachers in preference to females, although I am still of the opinion that even the lower standards could be more efficiently managed and taught by males than females, but it would not apply with so much force to these classes.

576. But your opinion would apply to all?—Yes; it is a matter of opinion.

577. In your opinion it comes to this: that if we had money enough to induce the male pupil-teachers to come forward, and they are prepared to do so, it is desirable that they should fill all positions in the schools with the exception of the positions of infant mistresses and sewing-mistresses?—From the standpoint I view it—of what is best in the interests of education, not involving other social and economic reasons, but purely in the interests of education—I should say that it is desirable. Of course, it may be that, in filling a particular position where a Board has to consider a number of applications from males and females, the real interests of education might be served by appointing one of the female applicants in preference to any one of the male applicants.

578. Why is it that male teachers are stronger and better in dealing with young children? Is it on the grounds of discipline, moral grounds, efficiency, or what?—Males are generally superior to females where questions of moral training and discipline are involved.

579. Do you think that is the opinion of teachers generally?—A male teacher shows superiority over a female teacher (if he be a man of the right stamp) in the matter of the training of the children, moral effect on the character, and discipline.

580. Do you think that the teaching profession is not a suitable one for our girls and women in New Zealand?—I am not prepared to give an opinion.

581. But in effect you have said so?—I do not wish to be taken as having said so.

582. In regard to the salaries paid to pupil-teachers under the Board, I see you pay fourth-class males £35; females, £22 10s.—a difference of £12 10s. in favour of males: second-class males, £50; females, £37 10s.: first-class males, £55; females, £42 10s.: do you think the difference in each case is sufficient?—Putting on one side for a moment my own experience as a member of the Southland Board, I should say that the difference ought to be sufficient; results would seem to point to the fact that the difference is not sufficient. Our experience on the Board goes to show that most of the applicants for positions in our schools are females, and very few males. If the increasing of the difference in pay to a much greater extent would induce more males into the profession, I would say that it should be increased.

583. It does not effect the result the Board desires—*i.e.*, to induce more male applicants?—One cannot say that altogether; if we adopted the suggested scale and equal payment, the chances are we should not have a single application from males.

584. You stated that you are strongly in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

585. You think it would be better to have a colonial scale fixed by the Commission, the central department, or the Legislature, instead of being arranged by the Education Boards?—Yes; fixed in any proper and legal manner.

586. You consider that the appointment of teachers should be dealt with by the department?—No, I do not. I am not in favour of the appointment of teachers being regulated by the department. I am still in favour, and strongly so, of teachers being appointed by the Board's in conjunction with the Committees; but I say that if the department devised a reasonable method by which it could be effected, and then asked the Boards and Committees to make the appointments in accordance with it that, it would be satisfactory.

587. You want the appointments to be regulated?—Yes.

588. Under departmental regulations?—Yes.

589. And you also think that the grants to Committees should be fixed in the same way—not by the Boards?—I do.

590. What duties would you leave to the Boards to perform?—The main part of their duties: the administration and provision of education in each Board's own particular district. I do not see that the mere fact of the department fixing a reasonable scale by which teachers should be paid, and asking Boards to act on it, is in any way interfering or depriving them of their powers.

591. If you take away the power from the Boards of fixing salaries and incidental allowances, what functions have the Boards to perform that could not be performed adequately by the School Committees: would they not become absolute excresences?—I should say that any one who had a few years' experience on an Education Board would scarcely require to ask that question.

592. You say that your principal reasons for removing those powers from Boards is in order to do away with what you call bones of contention between the Boards and Committees: where would those bones of contention go?—They would disappear altogether.

593. Would they disappear, or be trans erred somewhere else?—So long as they were removed we would not care.

594. If this scale is determined upon by Parliament, do you think it is going to settle our system of education altogether—that there will be no need of revision or alteration from year to year?—I hope it will not settle the matter altogether, for we are always progressing, or hope to be. It will be in the interests and benefit of education if it is adopted; I do not say finally settled.

595. Do you think it would be to the benefit of education to sweep away Education Boards altogether?—It would depend upon what took their place.

596. Supposing we had School Committees and schools manned by male teachers?—I think it would be very injudicious.

597. Do you think it would be beneficial to the schools if the female teachers were starved out of them?—It cannot be done; it would not be beneficial.

598. Would not such a course, in your opinion, tend to strengthen the schools and improve the system of education?—I do not think the Government or any body would be justified in doing such a thing.

599. You know the method adopted by the bees in order to get rid of the drones: would you not apply the same method?—I do not look on them as drones.

600. But you think, or say, that they are inefficient?—No, I do not say that. It is a question as to which are the more efficient as teachers—men or women.

Miss Hamilton, Assistant Mistress of the Nightcaps School, examined.

Miss Hamilton: Since seeing the alternative scheme of salaries submitted by Mr. Hogben I have not a very great deal to say on the question. According to it, we country mistresses are in almost the same position financially as before. We do not consider ourselves by any means too well paid, considering the responsibility we have. On us depends the quality of the work done throughout the whole school. In the schools having two teachers the mistress has charge of the infant department and Standards I. and II., and if her work is not done thoroughly no head-teacher, however efficient, can hope to produce good work afterwards. Then, as a general rule, our classes are numerically larger than the classes in the upper room. Again, it requires a six-years' course of study to fit ourselves for the position, and the salaries we get after such a long course of preparation are scarcely sufficient to repay us. Another point to be considered is that an infant mistress is expected to teach singing, kindergarten work, sewing, to be able to play some musical instrument for musical drill, &c., in the infant department, and she will shortly be required to teach dress-cutting and cooking. Whilst she is studying for her certificates she has no time to

gain more than a superficial knowledge of these things, and if, after gaining her D classification, she can only command a salary sufficient to keep her she cannot take classes in these subjects to perfect herself in them. Mr. Neill drew your attention to the difficulty experienced in getting lady teachers to accept appointments in the country. Until the salaries in the country schools are sufficient to repay them for the giving-up of the advantages of a town-life this difficulty will continue to exist. Another point I would like to refer to is "equal pay for equal work." The pupil-teachers under the proposed scale get equal pay, both male and female, and that is quite as it ought to be. We ought also to claim equal pay as assistants in the town schools up to Standard III. The work we do in Standards III., II., and I. is precisely the same work as that expected from the male assistants, and the discipline under us is quite as efficient. In the upper standards very possibly we are not able to keep up the same standard of efficiency and discipline, and there may be a difference of opinion in that respect; but, as I said before, from Standard III. down we should receive equal pay with the males.

601. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] What is the average attendance of your school?—About 86.

602. What salary do you get?—£100.

603. Have you considered how this proposed or suggested scale would affect a school like yours?—So far as I am concerned, it will be exactly in the same position.

604. With regard to the question of equal pay for equal work, do you consider that a female sole teacher in a country school, with all standards, having an attendance of about 30, can conduct and efficiently maintain that school as a male teacher could?—No.

605. In larger schools you consider that a female teacher can as efficiently teach from Standard III. downwards as a male teacher could?—Yes.

606. In regard to very small children, would a female teacher be more efficient?—Yes.

607. You are in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

608. *Mr. Weston.*] What, in your opinion, is the lowest salary that should be paid to a lady teacher?—I think, £100 in the country schools, for the reason that we are so shut out from the advantages to be gained in the town. We have no opportunity of continuing our own education satisfactorily, and unless we get a salary sufficient to pay our train fare to town, and the cost of our classes there, we are seriously handicapped.

609. You say you are receiving a salary of £100?—Yes.

610. Are you satisfied with £100 in the position you occupy?—My school is not the smallest class of schools.

611. You say, in your opinion, the minimum salary that should be paid to a lady teacher is £100?—Yes; but that would not hold good for an assistantship in a town school.

612. What salary do you consider a lady teacher in a town school should receive?—I think she should commence at a salary of not less than £80 a year.

613. What salary should a lady teacher in a school the size of yours receive?—I am not prepared to say; taking the minimum salary as £100, we ought certainly to receive £110.

614. And, that being so, you are not satisfied with your present salary?—No; as the second rank we should get a little more.

615. In your opinion, should Standards I., II., and III. be taught by female teachers?—Yes.

616. *Mr. Hogben.*] What is the minimum salary paid to a mistress at the present time, according to the regulations of the Southland Board?—£70 per annum.

617. Under the alternative scheme, what is the salary that a mistress would receive in a school of, say, an attendance of about 60?—£90.

618. So that the alternative scheme gives, in such schools, an improvement in the salary of £20 a year?—Yes.

619. In a school with an average attendance of 70 what is the salary at present paid by the Southland Board?—£70.

620. And under the alternative scale what would be the salary paid in such a school?—£100.

621. An improvement of £30 in salary?—Yes.

622. So that the position of some of the female teachers would be considerably improved in regard to the minimum salary paid?—Yes.

623. Not quite so much as you would like to see?—No.

624. *The Chairman.*] What standards have you charge of now?—Standards I. and II.

625. Supposing you took charge of Standard III., would it add very much to your work?—Yes, very considerably.

626. Do you think you would be able to perform your work efficiently if such were the case?—No; not without assistance.

627. How many teachers are there in your school?—Two.

628 A headmaster and yourself?—Yes.

629. I see, under the scale, a headmaster in a school like yours would be allowed a salary of about £206—that is, in a school with an attendance of 86. Considering the work you perform in taking charge of Standards I. and II. and the infant department, do you think it fair that you should be paid less than one-half the salary the headmaster receives?—No, I do not. I have about 60 children under my care. He has Standards III., IV., V., VI., and VII.—about 38 children; and I have practically five classes also.

630. You have the breaking-in of the younger children?—Yes.

631. On that account you consider you should be paid a little more than one-half the salary paid to the master for the tuition of the more advanced classes?—Yes.

W. G. Mehaffey, Headmaster of the Middle School, Invercargill, examined.

Mr. Mehaffey: I should like to make a few remarks respecting the principal effect the proposed scale would have on such a school as that of which I have the management. The effect

would be to cause me to lose the services of two very efficient teachers. I refer to the second and third male assistants. Under the proposed scale the reduction suffered by those teachers would be so considerable that I do not anticipate they would wish to retain their positions longer than they could help.

632. *Mr. Hogben.*] In than respect, are you referring to the first scale submitted or to the alternative scale?—I am referring to the first scale submitted.

633. I should like to point out to you that under the alternative scale the salaries of assistants of all schools in the colony would be raised up to a standard equal to that of the highest scale now paid in the colony?—Then, if there are to be no deductions, I am certainly in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries, and I may also mention, at the same time, that I have advocated it for the last twenty years. Another point to which I should like to refer is that the pupil-teacher element predominates too strongly in most of the schools. I have seven pupil-teachers in my school to four assistant teachers, and I suggest that the number of assistants should be increased and the number of pupil-teachers reduced. I am of the opinion that that would be a step in the right direction, and would tend to the greater efficiency of the schools. With respect to the classification fixed for the different types of schools, I think D1 should be considered sufficient classification for any primary school. It has been so in the past, and in consequence of that teachers have not thought it necessary to expend their energies in prosecuting their studies in order to gain higher certificates, and therefore I am of opinion that present head-teachers should not be penalised because their classification is D1. I think the same practice adopted under similar circumstances in Victoria should be adopted here—that is, to classify teachers according to their schools.

634. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] In comparing the suggested scheme of staffing with the staff in your school, how will it affect you?—It affords two additional assistants.

635. What about the number of pupil-teachers?—It would give two assistants and take away one pupil-teacher.

636. Are you in favour of the substitution of an assistant, where practicable, for two pupil-teachers?—I should much prefer one thoroughly qualified and experienced teacher to two inexperienced teachers, though, of course, taking the question broadly, much would depend on the quality of the assistant and of the pupil-teachers.

637. How many pupils do you consider a class-teacher can efficiently manage in Standard IV.?—50.

638. And in Standard V.?—The same number.

639. Would you consider a Fourth Standard with from 70 to 80 children too much work for one assistant?—Yes; in such a case an assistant should have the assistance of a pupil-teacher either for the whole day, or at least for portion of the day.

640. You stated you are in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries, and that you advocated it for a number of years?—Yes.

641. You consider that, once a colonial scale is adopted, instead of the present capitation grant of £3 15s., Parliament will vote a round sum based not on the number of pupils so much as on what will be required to meet the cost and expenses in connection with the administration of the Education Act?—I think the present capitation is quite insufficient.

642. Do you consider the Southland Education Board has been rather liberal in the establishment of small schools?—That is a question I have not gone into. I am certain the Southland Board has given as generous salaries as it was able with the means at its disposel.

643. Do you consider that the Legislature should state a minimum number below which a school should not be established, so that the pressure brought to bear on Education Boards in some cases at the present time would be done away with?—Yes; I think there should be a minimum, or else there should be some such method as that of itinerant teachers.

644. Do you find that female assistants in the large schools practically do the same work as males, and also as efficiently?—I have been in charge of large schools, and I say female teachers do not do the same work as males.

645. Do you consider that Standards IV., V., VI., and VII. should be taught by male teachers?—I have always found that necessary.

646. In a school with an average attendance equal to that of the school of which you have charge, do you consider that there should be three male assistants?—Yes, I consider that there should be three male assistants; I require three.

647. You would not favour the suggested alternating of male and female assistants on the staff of a large school?—I do not mind the alternating, provided the salary is sufficient to enable good men to hold the positions. If the alternating necessitated the payment of small salaries to the male assistants, then I do not think the scheme would tend towards the efficiency of our schools. The reduction of assistants' salaries would cause large schools to lose the services of efficient teachers, and would have the effect of deterring young men of parts from entering the profession. It is necessary to have male assistants for the higher standards (IV., V., VI., and VII.), especially where these classes are large, and those who take the higher standards should have the higher status and higher emoluments. Referring to the pupil-teacher element again, in my school of from 570 to 600, as I said, there are seven pupil-teachers to six adult teachers. The pupil-teachers would not all find places when they got through their course; but many of them, being girls and marrying, leave the profession, thus creating vacancies. In the proposed scheme such a school would have seven pupil-teachers and eight adult teachers, but some of these adult teachers would most probably be teachers of very little experience.

648. Have you compared the salaries paid under the Southland Board to teachers in a school like yours to the salaries that obtain in similar schools in Otago?— In Otago they are, on the whole, paid somewhat higher. Otago is able to pay its teachers more owing to the capitation system of giving moneys to Boards.

649. But the Otago schools are not so liberally staffed?—I think their staffing compares very favourably with the staffing under the Southland Board, so far as I have noticed.

650. Taking the suggested scale as a whole, do you consider it would be beneficial to Southland teachers in the matter of staffing and the payment of salaries?—If you mean the scale of salaries I have been considering, the first scale submitted, I do not think it would tend to the efficiency of the schools; but I think the alternative scale, taken in conjunction, more of a step in the right direction.

651. Do you think encouragement should be given to the teachers in the country schools?—Yes.

652. With regard to teachers growing old in the service, would you favour a superannuation scheme or retiring-allowance for their benefit?—Yes. I may mention, if I had remained in Victoria I should have been entitled to a pension at the present time, but through my coming to New Zealand I have lost all chance of it.

653. Regarding these small schools, would you favour the conveying of children from outlying districts to a central school in order to do away with the establishment of so many small schools?—Yes, undoubtedly.

654. Do you favour those side-schools outside of large townships?—I have had no experience of what are called side-schools.

655. You consider D1 classification should be the highest minimum required?—I said that teachers at the present time in large schools holding D1, where perhaps C1 or B1 is required, should not be penalised on that account, and in my opening remarks I gave my reasons for my opinion.

656. You think the older teachers, then, had not the same opportunity of obtaining those higher certificates as the teachers have now?—It was not a question of opportunity, but a question of whether it was thought necessary for them to obtain those higher certificates. A D1 certificate was considered quite sufficient, and to obtain higher certificates was considered a waste of energy; it seemed quite superfluous to attempt to do so. Speaking for myself twenty-two years ago, I thought that it was not at all necessary to expend energy in attempting to get a B1 or a C1 certificate.

657. *Mr. Stewart.*] It has been suggested that, in regard to the question of a colonial scale of staff and salaries, it might be better to allow the Boards to meet in conference and arrange a scale of payment among themselves: do you think that would be preferable to a duly considered colonial scale drawn up by a Commission appointed to deal with the matter?—I think that the colonial scale should come from the proper quarter—*i.e.*, the Education Commission or department.

658. Supposing the alternative I suggested were taken, would it mean or would it not mean, seeing that the membership of Boards changes from year to year, that their scale would be liable to change from year to year also?—Possibly so. I think the Boards change their membership a good deal.

659. On the grounds of permanency, you prefer that a colonial scale should be fixed from the headquarters and obtain throughout the colony?—Yes.

660. As we are constituted at present, with thirteen different scales of payment, do you think it would be possible to establish a compulsory scheme of insurance or retiring-allowance?—Not as at present constituted.

661. Do you think that a superannuation scheme would be easier to establish on an actual basis if a colonial scheme were drawn up?—Yes, undoubtedly.

662. Do you think it necessary, in the interests of public education, that at a certain time in life teachers should be retired from the service—at, say, sixty or or sixty-five years of age?—Yes. I think, too, after fifteen or twenty years' service, they should have a holiday to travel to Europe, if they wished, as is done in Victoria. I should put the age at which a teacher should be retired at sixty-five; at the present time a teacher works as long as he is tolerated, because there is no provision made for his retirement.

663. Under the suggested scheme you are of the opinion it would be easier to arrange a just scheme of retirement, than as things are at present?—Yes, I think so, because it is not possible at present.

664. How many assistants have you at the present time?—Four.

665. Will you kindly glance at the scale of staffing for one moment?—Yes; I see it gives six pupil-teachers, one less than I have; I see, in regard to staffing, there is one less all the way through.

666. You think that the proposed increase in the staffing is in the interests of the cause of education?—Yes, provided that the salaries are such as will provide as efficient assistants under a colonial scale as at present.

667. You think that the alteration of assistants as provided in the suggested scale would have the effect of lowering male assistants one grade, and that that would lower their salaries?—Yes.

668. In view of the Inspector-General's explanation that the assistants' salaries can be paid up to the highest standard obtaining in the colony, your objections on that head would entirely disappear?—Yes; if the salaries are not reduced my objections will disappear.

669. You think you would be able to retain just as efficient assistants under the proposed scale as under the Southland scale?—Yes, especially if the salaries are increased.

670. Then, the more you examine this question the more entirely you are in favour of it?—Yes.

671. *Mr. Hill.*] What do you think should be the maximum salary paid to a headmaster of a school corresponding with your own?—I do not know as to the maximum, but I should say the minimum salary paid should be £350.

672. What is your salary at the present time?—£300; it used to be £350 before the sad days of retrenchment.

673. Under the proposed scale you would be considerably improved in regard to salary?—I would receive £333—an advance of £33.

674, You do not consider an advance of £33 sufficient?—I think it is better than no advance at all, of course.

675. Have you a residence connected with your school?—Yes; I have a free house.

676. From your experience as a headmaster, what is your opinion as to the largest-sized school that can be efficiently managed?—I have been in schools with an attendance of over 1,000; but I think a school of 1,000 somewhat unwieldy. I think a school with an average attendance of 750 is quite as large a school as should be encouraged.

677. In a school with an average attendance of 750 would not some of the classes be duplicated?—Yes.

678. What would you propose in a school of 750 in such a case where there would be duplication?—I have found that large schools of 750 in Victoria produced better results, on the whole, than were found in the smaller schools.

679. How many pupils do you consider it advisable to give to the first assistant master in your school?—50 pupils; if more than 50, I should expect to give him the aid of a pupil-teacher.

680. That is, in charge of Standard VI.?—Yes.

681. Do you make it a rule to place the first assistant in charge of Standard VI.?—I do; it is not done invariably.

682. But you claim for yourself the right to modify the classification of your assistants?—Yes, I have had occasion to place assistants in various positions, and I have never found any objection offered.

683. Do you recognise the same principle throughout your school?—Yes.

684. Do you think it proper and advisable?—Yes, I do.

685. That the headmaster should have the distribution of his staff according to what he thinks is to the greater advantage of his school?—Yes; he should have the privilege of putting each teacher where that teacher can do the best work.

686. Does it not follow that you may put the first, second, or third master even down so low as to take charge of Standard II., for example?—I have never found it necessary to do that, though I have appointed the first assistant master to take charge of Standard IV.

687. Did you ever put any of the masters to take charge of the lower standards?—No. I remember a case in which I thought a mistress would do better work in charge of the Third Standard, while a junior mistress conducted the work of the infant department.

680. I suppose you thought that the work was as efficiently carried on?—Yes.

689. You recognise that your first, second, and third assistants are merely class masters?—Yes.

690. You recognise that there is a great nearness in responsibility in those standard classes?—I recognise that the responsibility is greater as the standards are higher.

691. In this proposed colonial scale reference was made yesterday as to the advisability of giving an optional power to the Education Boards in the matter of staffing schools: what do you think about that?—I think it would be well that the Boards should exercise an optional right. They have exercised it in the past, and when I have recommended an assistant male instead of a female they have granted it.

692. Of course, you recognise that this proposed staffing is ample really for the efficient working of a school?—Yes, I think it is ample.

693. It is an improvement on the scale recognised in this district?—Yes. It gives me one additional teacher, two assistants more, and one pupil-teacher less.

694. What is your classification?—D1.

695. Do you think any change in the present system of classification of teachers is advisable?—Seeing that D1 in the past was considered sufficient for the headmastership of any school, however large, it should be considered still a sufficient classification for those teachers in such schools; but I do not think there would be any harm, in appointments made in the future, if a certain classification should be required for a certain school, so long as that is known sufficiently long beforehand.

696. Do you not think that all the department has to see to is that the teacher is certificated, without reference to any class whatever?—I think a teacher ought to have a certificate showing that he is fully competent, and D1 would show that.

697. Does not E1 show that?—E1 does not seem to show sufficient literary qualification for a man to occupy the status of headmaster in a large school. I think there should be a certificate qualifying a teacher to take charge of any primary school, and a teacher might then add to that qualification by getting university distinction that would enhance his reputation from a literary point of view.

698. Suppose this scale or any similar scale was adopted, do you think care should be taken to conserve the rights of teachers who at present occupy positions in the various schools?—Undoubtedly.

699. Do you not think there would be a tendency on the part of School Committees to say to their teacher holding a low certificate, "You do not hold a certificate in accordance with the requirements; we will ask for a higher teacher"?—There is always that danger.

700. There would be no greater danger if the colonial scale were adopted?—I think that when a scale is adopted, teachers not having these requirements should have their certificates raised for departmental purposes.

701. Do you hold any opinion as the removal of Inspectors: do you think they should be centralised?—I think, for the benefit of the Inspectors, that they should be under a central department, if only for promotion, which is impossible now. As regards the advancement of the schools, speaking for the Southland District, I do not think it would matter a great deal. We are quite satisfied with our Inspectors down here.

702. *Mr. Smith.*] You alluded to the minimum size of a school: what, in your opinion, is the lowest number of scholars for which the Board should provide a fully equipped school?—That is a financial matter; but, I think, not smaller than 12. I think education should be provided for all in some way.

703. Supposing the number could not be raised, how do you propose that the children in very remote districts should be taught?—You might require to have some teachers who could travel from place to place. That system has been tried, but I do not know with what success.

704. It has been suggested that there should be separate scales set up for aided schools: do you think that would meet the case?—I think that would meet the case. It is in the power of the Government to make provision for such schools, and I think provision should be made.

A. CLARK, First Assistant, Winton, examined.

705. *The Chairman.*] What is your experience?—Generally in the country, although I am assistant in the Winton School at present.

706. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How many pupils do you think you could teach efficiently in a country school without any assistance?—I have taught up to 35, and I should not like to teach more than 40.

707. With the classification we have just now, and the grouping of the standards, do you think that a teacher can efficiently teach up to 40 unaided?—No, I should think not.

708. Are you in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes, decidedly.

709. Do you think the adoption of some colonial scale akin to this scheme would prove beneficial to the teachers of Southland?—The suggested scale considerably lowers the salaries of country teachers—the revised one—in the case of any schools I have had experience with. At present the salary for a school under 27 is £132, and by the second scheme presented the salary will be £132; but out of that the teacher will have to pay £10 for a sewing-mistress, reducing the salary to £122.

710. What is the average attendance at your school?—180.

711. What salary are you getting?—£130.

712. Are you in favour of a retiring-allowance or a superannuation fund?—Yes.

713. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think a colonial scale of staffs and salaries is the only way in which the anomaly existing at present can be remedied?—Yes. If I may state my experience as a teacher in a half-time school, I would like to say that I had to incur considerable expense in keeping a horse to ride between the schools. That cost me £10. At that time I was receiving a salary of £132. Since then the school has considerably decreased in attendance, and it is in charge of a lady, who is receiving a salary of £70. She must keep a horse, as well, as I did when I was in charge of it.

714. In the half-time schools you speak of, were the averages added together to calculate the teacher's salary?—Yes.

715. If the average attendance was 10 at one school and 11 at the other, the average was counted as 21?—Yes.

716. What was the total average attendance carrying a salary of £132?—27.

717. Do you know what the attendance has gone down to now?—No.

718. *Mr. Luke.*] Does this lady teach the two half-time schools?—Yes.

719. And has to ride from one school to the other?—Yes.

720. How does she divide the schools?—Day about, six days in the week.

721. Would it not be better to take three days at each school?—I found, myself, that it worked to take them day about, as the children were able to do a considerable amount of home-work in off days.

722. Did the system work well from an educational point of view?—It was the only way of working the schools in the far-back districts.

723. *Mr. Hill.*] Are you satisfied with the proposed salaries scale for assistants?—Not with the first scheme.

724. Well, with the alternative scheme, according to which it is understood that the salaries will be on the level of the highest at present paid in any district in the colony?—I am quite satisfied with that, because I took my present position for the sake of studying, and getting the advantage of efficient tutorage.

725. You occupy the position of first assistant?—Yes, in a school of between 150 and 200. By the first scheme I would be reduced to second assistant at £90, because a mistress would come in before me.

726. If under the alternative scale the salary was raised to £150, would you be satisfied?—Under the circumstances, being able to study whilst holding the position, I would be satisfied.

727. *Mr. Hogben.*] What is the salary for a school of 20 in Southland?—£115 for a male, and £100 for a female, I think.

728. What is it under the proposed scale?—£128 for a male, £104 for a female.

729. What is the salary for a school of 30 in Southland now?—From memory, I should say £135.

730. Under the proposed scale what is it?—£140.

731. What is the salary for a school of 35 in Southland?—£140.

732. What is it under the proposed scale?—£150.

733. What is it for a school of 40 in Southland?—£144.

734. And under the proposed scale?—£160.

735. From that point you will see that the salaries of headmasters are higher than are at present in existence in Southland?—Yes.

736. Next comes the question of the sewing-mistress: how many of the masters do you think, in the Southland schools of 20 to 30, are married?—I could not say, but I am married myself.

737. Do you think the majority of them are married?—I have no idea.

738. In the case of a married man, is it not probable that in nine cases out of ten his wife would be able to teach sewing?—Yes; but I should pride myself on being able to support my wife myself.

739. That is a matter of sentiment; but, as far as the money going into the family is concerned, it would make no difference, would it?—I may state that before I became a married man my sister kept house for me. She was not supposed to teach sewing, but she did, and retained to herself the right to entertain any visitors that might come in during the time sewing was on. Under the proposed conditions, however, the wife would be compelled to attend in the school at the stated hour.

740. Is a sewing-mistress paid for now in the Southland District?—No.

741. How is it taught in these small schools?—It is not taught where there is a male teacher.

742. Is not sewing one of the subjects set down in the syllabus?—Where there are female teachers.

743. The Board does not appoint sewing-mistresses in these small schools?—Yes.

744. In the case of married men the deduction under the proposed scale is more a matter of sentiment than anything else—no real deduction is made?—Teachers' wives, as a rule, find plenty to do with their household duties.

745. You do not think a teacher's wife is a suitable person to teach sewing?—In many cases she would be a suitable person, but it would be a hardship for her to do so. At the same time it would be an assistance in making both ends meet.

746. A deduction would be made absolutely in the case of unmarried men?—Yes.

747. But you think also in the case of married men it would be a hardship that their wives should be compelled to teach sewing?—The wife may possibly require to have assistance, which would swallow up the £10.

748. *The Chairman.*] You do not approve of a tax of £10 a year on bachelors?—No.

749. Do you think you could manage to get the sewing taught for a less sum than £10 a year, for two hours a week?—I would not ask any one to undertake it for less than £10 a year.

750. Not if you had a settler's wife near the school who was willing to do it for half the money?—If she were willing to do it, that would be another matter.

751. Have sewing-mistresses been paid in any school that you have had?—No.

752. Do you think the children suffer very seriously in small country schools through not being taught sewing?—No.

753. You do not approve of the first colonial scale of salaries scheme submitted because you think that in some instances it would prove injurious to assistants. If you are assured that the new scale will in no instance reduce salaries, but raise them to the very highest scale paid, will you then approve of it?—Yes.

754. But on that condition alone?—Yes.

CHARLES W. G. SELBY, representing the Assistant Teachers, examined.

Mr. Selby: I represent the assistant teachers of Southland whose salaries are to be reduced by the scale of staffs and salaries now being promulgated from the Education Department, Wellington. On the broad principle of equal payment for teachers in all districts of the colony, we signed a petition to both Houses of the Legislature. The attention of the Government was drawn to the insufficiency of teachers' salaries in some of the northern districts. In last session of Parliament £8,250 was voted for levelling-up purposes, so that the anomalies pointed out might be done away with. The Act granting the money bore the title of "An Act to enable Provision to be made for the Better Payment of Teachers in Public Schools." On the 21st September the Hon. Mr. Hall-Jones, in replying to a question, said, "The House would realise the difficulties . . . if they were to avoid any injustice being done to any class of teachers." In the course of a debate on the subject in the House on the 12th October, the honourable member for Wallace (Mr. Gilfedder) said that "by granting 5s. extra capitation to each Board they would simply be increasing the pay of those who already enjoyed good salaries without making adequate provision for teachers in the service of Boards financially weak." Then, in the Legislative Council, on the 19th October, the Minister of Education (Hon. W. C. Walker) told the Council that "Every school-teacher in every part of the colony should be on exactly the same footing as regards salary and appointments as they are now in one or two of the more prosperous districts." We have therefore, first of all, on behalf of the assistants in this district, to protest that the framers of the scale have not taken into full consideration the reasons for its preparation, nor the intentions of Parliament on the subject. In the preamble to the proposed scheme we are told that its object is "to give such salaries as will attract good teachers, or to prevent the best teachers from going into other professions." Why, even at the present rates of payment there is a continual loss of assistants, who enter other professions, many of whom have seen long service, with little hope of any betterment. We find ex-assistants capable of rendering good service to the State now in the ranks of sharebrokers, lawyers, politicians, clergymen, doctors, shopkeepers, and other businesses. We beg to state that the salaries shown in the proposed colonial scale will not be sufficient to attract good teachers to assistantships. An idea is abroad that the proposal to reduce the salaries of assistants in large towns is made with a purpose—that of driving these teachers into the country. As it happens, the Otago Board has a regulation which works in the opposite direction. It is, "Special consideration shall be given to the claims of teachers who have served the Board well in remote or out-of-the-way places," and, although the Southland Board has no explicit regulation to that effect, it acts up to such a regulation in spirit. All our town- and country-school assistants have thus seen long service, and have served the Board in remote districts. Since I first went into the country, twenty-three years ago, to take charge of a small school I have been in every grade of school, and had eighteen years and a half of country-school

work. For the last four years and a half I have been first assistant in Invercargill Middle School. The assistant at Winton (also a married man with a family) has been eleven years and a half in the service; his salary is to be reduced from £130 to £90 a year. The assistant master at Riverton, with seventeen years' experience, another married man with a wife and family, is to experience a like reduction. And if I were to detail the effect of the new scale upon assistants, it would be the same story over again in each case, excepting that some are not married, and the reductions, if carried out, will prevent their marrying. Not a desirable result, I should say, more especially in the case of teachers. The scheme sets forth that it endeavours to "increase generally the salaries paid to women, especially to women holding responsible positions." What is denoted by that word "responsible"? Some of our lady assistants wish to point out that the mistresses in such schools as the Park School, the Mataura, and Riverton Schools will become first assistant at £105 a year each (a reduction of £10 a year); surely their positions are sufficiently responsible, seeing that they have to initiate and teach all the branches of kindergarten work and to carry on the sewing of several classes. It would seem, however, that the lady who in a school of 500 does no practical teaching, but adopts the *rôle* of "headmistress," and has a strong corps of subordinates to carry on the practical work of the infant department—it would seem that her responsibility is assessed at £170 to the others' £105. The males in the larger schools are hardly as liberally considered. By giving the mistresses in the larger school £65 a year more than the one in the smaller the proposed scale creates the disparity which Parliament seeks to have removed. No business firm would attempt to cut down the salaries of its assistants in similar circumstances—*i.e.*, (1) when its directorate had voted (or was willing to vote) the money for an increase of the lower salaries; (2) when it was enjoying an annual surplus. There is no demand for retrenchment; we suffered from that on previous occasions. Yet the department has put forward this scheme of reduction, has withdrawn and amended it, and reissued the scheme with the reduction of assistants still a prominent feature. The only tangible reason given for such a step is that the Government proposes to employ "cheaper hands," so as to be able to get more of them. I may quote the Hon. Mr. Seddon's views on this point. Speaking in the House on the 16th October, he said, "As Colonial Treasurer, I have something to say, I presume, on matters of this kind, and I ought to take very good care not to offend or be a party to cut down teachers' salaries, where at present the salaries, in my opinion, are not at all too high. I am not going to be a party to anything of that kind." The proposals, to which we as assistants offer objections, are contrary to the professions and intentions of the Government, the Premier, the Minister of Education, the Hon. Hall-Jones, and the leading members of the Liberal party, and we venture to hope that the department will not be allowed to override all the "powers that be." A fully qualified teacher and a pupil-teacher may at the present time easily work together with two classes in one room, in order that the former may properly supervise the work of the pupil-teacher. In place of these put two assistants, and they must be put in separate rooms, and there will be the cost of building to be reckoned on in a large number of schools. Then, the separate teachers will not be so trustworthy or capable at the reduced salaries, for good men can only be got at a fair wage—which £90 is not. A great onus will be cast upon headmasters if they are to preserve the present high degree of disciplinary efficiency. In some cases it will probably be found that females will offer for the lower positions, but males will not, and in this way it is likely that many of our schools will ere long become "dame" schools. This is the more likely to be the case as certain positions are "ear-marked" for females. The allotment of the first assistantships in such schools as Park School and the Bluff School to females, and the second and every alternate assistantship (in schools up to 600 pupils) also to females, is a most objectionable regulation. The positions should be open to either male or female—the fact of which would be selection being determined by the law of supply and demand, and also to some extent by the preference of the individual School Committees. The staff in the Middle School, Invercargill, would be so affected by the proposed regulations that the present third assistant would have to be the fifth, at a salary of £90 a year (he has had fourteen years' experience, including his pupil-teachership and a head-teachership); there would have to be a lady teacher next above him as fourth assistant; the present second assistant (male) would have to drop down to the third assistantship at £120 a year, while above him there would be a lady as second assistant to take charge of the Fifth Standard; and, besides this lady, there will be another one designated the infant mistress at £170: the scale is certainly liberal enough to some females. The Conciliation Boards and the Arbitration Courts have fixed a skilled workman's wages at 10s. a day, which runs up to £150; unskilled labour has in many places established its claim in many lines of work at 8s. per day — or, deducting a weekly half-holiday, £114 a year. The training of a teacher is a costly matter, yet here we may have two male assistants in the second largest school in Southland reduced to a lower wage than the hod-carrier, whose training was not costly. The teacher's salary should give, besides a living-wage, some interest on the money that has been spent by his parents in his education and training, or by himself in the same direction. And that is a specific reason why he should be paid more than the unskilled labourer claims. The teacher must go through an apprenticeship of gaining the information necessary for the literary requirements of his work; and he must undergo a pedagogic and psychological training to fit him to develop the incipient faculties of the young minds committed to his charge. Such preparation cannot be carried out at no cost. How will it do to put women in as second and first assistants? Very few women are naturally fit for managing the three upper standards in large schools. The pupils—both boys and girls—in those standards are at an age when even their own mothers find them somewhat difficult to control. They do not question the power of a male teacher: they tacitly acknowledge his authority, and he maintains control without any display of force. To do this a woman has to put on an air of self-assertiveness; she has her nerves continually on the rack; it is killing work for her, and she soon shows it in her face

by a habitual pinched expression of features. Women are more at home in those departments of school whose functions are nearest akin to the nursery. We could, if necessary, have called lady witnesses who would say, "Pay us a fair living-wage, *plus* interest on the cost of our training, and we want nothing higher than our present duty." We would urge the fact that we do not object to "equal pay for equal work." It may not be forgotten that the assistant in a large school has to fulfil an obligation in regard to dress and appearances generally; also, he must be a student of current literature, and for this he must pay. He must also take an interest in the hobbies of his pupils (which leads him into some expense), and he has to stand forth in his social circle as a "guide, philosopher, and friend." At this time of national prosperty no assistant teacher ever dreamed of a coming reduction in salaries. The reduction in some cases of over £60 a year comes upon some who have insured their lives to secure a sum which, when death removed the breadwinner, might keep his heirs-at-law off the parish. Others have looked in vain to the Government to provide a superannuation fund, and have at last incurred the obligations requisite to provide an endowment assurance payable to themselves in old age if they survive the endowment period. Others, again, have entered into pledges to enable them to erect a home of their own. Surely they were right in considering that, during good behaviour, they had a vested title to such salaries as were apportioned to them in the past. That they will be unable to fulfil these obligations would have mattered little if a kindly Government had shown any inclination to establish a superannuation fund. In regard to the first assistantship in a school of about 570, there is one point I would touch upon. The headmaster is to get over £330, and is in most cases provided with a residence which is generally worth about £40 or £50 a year, free of rates; the first assistant is to get £220 only, which is £110 less, and no house—or equivalent to £160 less than his chief. The first assistant has to be capable of taking temporary charge of the school on occasions of emergency. Surely, as he has to be capable of doing the headmaster's duty, on occasion, there should not be such a disparity in salaries. By the new scale the headmaster's salary (no doubt justly) goes up, but the first assistant, whose qualifications and experience must fit him to do the same work when urgency requires it, is penalised to the extent of £10 a year. The classification proposals, too, are slightly peculiar. In a school of over 600 the female first assistant (or head of girls' department) must hold a B2 certificate, while the infant mistress at the same salary is eligible with only a D1 certificate. Again, the headmaster of a school of over 500 must be a C1, otherwise he must pay an annual fine of 1 per cent. per class below that and 4 per cent. per division. If a man is competent to conduct the school, why should he be fined? But if he be not competent, surely he should not be there. There is likely to be a great deal of fining if no teacher whose certificate is under C1 may hold a school of over 250 pupils.

755. *Mr. Luke.*] Have you read the proposed scale, and heard Mr. Hogben's explanation that there will be enough money to raise the salaries of assistants up to the highest scale in the colony?—That meets the desire we teachers had in our minds when we petitioned Parliament first. The question is, which is the highest scale? Some people are talking about Otago's scale being the highest, but the Otago scale is not the highest one in every part of the service.

756. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you suggest that teachers having the same certificates should have the same salary?—I think that is rather hard-and-fast. It might be difficult to fill all the equal-salaried positions with men of the same certificates.

757. Supposing, for example, that the position of headmaster was occupied by a D1, and the position of assistant was occupied by a D1, would you suggest that the salaries of these two men should be the same?—I never said anything like that. I believe in equal pay for equal work.

758. Do you think an infant mistress should get a smaller salary than the first assistant teacher in the same school?—I cannot see why she should get the same salary as the first assistant. My training has enabled me to take any class, and with a little practice in the newer kindergarten work I could teach the various branches of that branch also; but I do not think the mistress could take the same class as the assistant.

759. If a teacher has been properly trained, that teacher should be able to take little children as well as big ones?—I do not say that my ability was got by training only; it was got by experience as well. My experience includes a case where I had to initiate and carry on the kindergarten work till I taught it to the pupil-teacher and monitors, as the mistress declared her inability to take this branch of work in hand.

760. You think that the infant mistress possesses special qualifications as distinct from other teachers in the school?—No, I do not say that; but she does not possess the special qualifications to enable her to fill other positions in the school.

761. How does she obtain her certificates?—I suppose, by examination.

762. Then, she should possess the necessary knowledge?—Well, I cannot see your argument.

763. Do you think a teacher should be retained as infant mistress, or should she be put where the headmaster chooses?—If he finds that she is not fit for the position of infant mistress I think the headmaster ought to have power to put some one else there.

764 You think the headmaster ought to be able to distribute his staff as he pleases?—He has that power now; I do not think it has been questioned.

765. *Mr. Hogben.*] All your remarks in your opening statement are based on the first proposed scale of staffs and salaries?—Yes.

766. They do not take into account the suggested or alternative scheme or remarks that accompany it?—No.

767. *The Chairman.*] If you were assured that the alternative scheme would raise the whole of the salaries to the level of the highest salaries now existing, would you approve of it?—I think so

768. You alluded to the amount that was voted by Parliament for the better payment of teachers: had you any information as to how it was supposed to level up the salaries with this extra money?—No; I do not think the proposals were made public.

769. Do you know whether the Southland Board adopted those proposals?—No.

770. If the Board were provided with sufficient money to raise the salaries in the Southland District to the highest rate in any education district in New Zealand, do you think that would do away with existing grievances?—Yes.

771. And the teachers would be satisfied?—I think so.

772. I take it you are of opinion that the salaries of assistants as first proposed are generally quite inadequate?—Yes; but I am quite satisfied with my own as now paid.

773 You think the difference between the salaries of headmasters and assistants is too great?—I do not think the headmasters are too highly paid

774. Do you think they are sufficiently paid?—Nearly. The Otago and Southland scales are very satisfactory.

J. Porteous, M.A., Assistant, Invercargill South School, examined.

775. *Mr. Stewart.*] You quite understand by this time what is the position of the two scales on the table—that they are simply evidence?—Yes.

776. Speaking generally, which do you prefer should prevail in the future—thirteen scales of payment throughout the colony liable to be revised by three months' notice, or one scale of payment fixed by Parliament?—I should prefer one scale fixed by Parliament.

777. Do you think that a scale fixed by Parliament would give you a more secure tenure than one fixed by the Boards?—I think so.

778. It has been suggested that it might be met in another way—namely, by the Boards conferring together and agreeing to a scale among themselves: do you think that an adequate settlement of the difficulty?—If it would be a binding agreement.

779. Could it be made binding?—I do not know.

780. You think the *personnel* of the Boards might change?—Yes.

781. Would one Board think the same as the Board before them did?—They might and they might not.

782. Therefore, would that scheme be as safe as one fixed by Parliament?—I think not.

783. Your objection, I take it, is to the alternation of male and female assistants?—Yes.

784. Do you think it a better plan to arrange the assistants in this way: first, second, third, male assistants, and females in the same way, classifying the females in the school independent of the males?—I do not know that there is any reason for doing that.

785. Do you think that in schools, say, of an average attendance of 400 and upwards the first two assistants should be males?—I do; I think the first three assistants should be males; but at the same time I think it would be just as well to have open competition for these positions between males and females.

786. You think it would be better, in calling for applications for a position of second assistant, of third, or of fourth respectively, to leave the sex unmentioned, and allow the question of the appointment of a male or of a female to be settled on the applications?—Yes, I would be in favour of that.

787. Do you think that would lead to a preponderance of one sex in the schools?—No; I think the males would always receive the preference for the higher assistantships.

788. That would be unfair to the ladies, would it not?—I do not think the ladies would complain of open competition.

789. Have you compared the scale in use in Southland with those of other parts of the colony?—Not very carefully.

790. *The Chairman.*] You prefer a scale of salaries fixed by Parliament to one fixed by the Boards, on the ground that there is a liability of the Boards' scheme being changed: is there anything to prevent Parliament revising the salaries from time to time?—I do not know that there is.

791. Does the *personnel* of Parliament change from time to time?—Yes.

792. And do you not think that it changes very seriously and much more than that of Boards, as a rule?—Yes; but teachers have votes for members of Parliament.

793. Do you not think that public opinion changing might have a very bad effect on your salaries?—I do not know.

794. Are you willing to accept a colonial scale as an experiment, and run the risk of the salaries in this district being reduced?—Yes, I think so.

795. You would take the risk?—Yes.

TIMARU.

Monday, 27th May, 1901.

A. Bell, Assistant Inspector and Assistant Secretary to the South Canterbury Education Board, examined.

1. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you seen the proposed colonial scale of staff and salaries—I refer to No. 2, the suggested alternative?—Yes, I have seen it.

2. I find on looking through the list of schools in your district that there are only three not included in schools having an average attendance up to 330: is that so?—Yes, that is right.

3. So that the alternative scale covers nearly the whole of the schools in your district?—Yes with the exception of the three.

4. Have you looked at the suggested scale in reference to staffing of schools?—Yes I have examined it.

5. Do you approve of the addition to the staff of a school of a certificated mistress when the average attendance reaches 40?—Yes, I do; that is exactly in accordance with our present staffing in South Canterbury.

6. Do you think that a sole teacher can efficiently manage a school up to 40?—Yes.

7. At 90 the next addition to the staff after a head-teacher and mistress is a pupil-teacher: do you approve of that?—Yes; according to our present scale a pupil-teacher is added when the attendance reaches 86, so that there is not a great deal of difference between our scale and the proposed colonial scale.

8. Do you think it is sufficiently liberal to allow of a pupil-teacher coming in at 90?—Yes, I think so.

9. At 120 you notice a second pupil-teacher is added to the staff?—Yes; that is more liberal than our scale. According to our scale a second pupil-teacher is not added until the attendance reaches 196; but an assistant is added at 146, and then a second pupil-teacher at 196.

10. Then, this suggested scale is more liberal than the scale provided in South Canterbury?—Yes, at that stage; but the addition of the second pupil-teacher affects only two of our schools.

11. Have you noticed the salaries allotted to the various positions?—Yes; I have made a comparison, and drawn up a list showing the salaries at present paid and the salaries according to this alternative scale.

12. Do you approve of the £5 capitation grant for schools of from 1 to 14?—Yes; it is in accordance with our present scale.

13. What is the salary at present paid in South Canterbury in schools between 14 and 19?—Well, the capitation grant is £5 up to 13 pupils, and for each unit from 14 to 24 pupils it is £4, so that in a school of 14 the salary would be £69.

14. Altogether, the second scheme, in regard to salaries, is more liberal than your existing scale?—Yes, except, I think, when the average attendance reaches 25; at that average I think there is only one teacher who would suffer a decrease according to the alternative scale, and that would be about 6s.

15. Are you in favour of penalising teachers whose certificates are below the required standard?—In some cases I think the certificate required is rather a high one. For instance, from 19 to 35 in average attendance an E2 certificate is required. I think that is rather severe, and I would suggest that an E3 or a D4 would be sufficient.

16. You think that the standard of certificates required according to this scale should be revised?—Yes.

17. Are you in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries for the colony?—Most decidedly.

18. *Mr. Stewart.*] Can you give the Commission any idea as to the total amount gained in salaries by your teachers under the suggested scale over what they receive at present?—Yes. I have prepared returns showing the amounts gained, according to the alternative scheme, by head-teachers, infant mistresses, and assistants. Sixty-eight head-teachers in this district would gain £1,258 10s. 7d.—that is, after deducting the penalties for low certificates in certain cases; twenty-eight infant mistresses in this district would gain £646 2s.; and nineteen assistants, adding four more as provided by the scale, would benefit to the extent of £636 16s. The four extra assistants would be—one at Timaru South, one at Waimate, one at Timaru Main School, and one at Waimataitai.

19. Then, the total number of assistants would be how many?—Twenty-three. The average increase would be—head-teachers £18, infant mistresses £23, and assistants £9 4s.

20. Would the suggested scale of the Inspector-General's materially benefit your country schools?—Yes. I think there would be only three small country schools that would not be benefited. I am not taking into account the £15 a year we grant to fifteen head-teachers in lieu of residences.

21. *The Chairman.*] Then, £15 a year is allowed in lieu of residence?—Yes.

22. *Mr. Stewart.*] Looking at the first scale on page 3, you notice a memorandum as to house allowance: do you notice that even that £15 is provided for, as it is proposed to make special provision for house allowance independently of the scale that will be made? Do you think that the adoption of such a scale as this would have the effect of relieving the finances of your Board generally?—It would benefit the teachers; it would not benefit the Board.

23. Have you any idea as to what is the average expense of your Board *per capita* outside of salaries and building grants?—Yes; I have made a rough return here. The total expense, excluding salaries, last year was £2,708 8s. 5d., and the average attendance was 4,470, I think. Excluding March, 1900, and including March, 1901, 4,472; I think it comes to about 12s. Reckoning 11s. 3d., as proposed, would give us £2,515 10s. Adding to that the extra £250, it would amount to £2,765 10s., and according to that we gain about £57, so that our administrative fund would be slightly increased.

24. Whilst benefiting the salaries of the teachers throughout the South Canterbury District, it would embarrass your Board by allowing a less sum of money than your expenses were last year?—No; but our incidental allowances are low compared with those given in other districts. To the highest schools we allow only 3s., while in North Canterbury 5s. is allowed.

25. *Mr. Luke.*] How many schools have you?—Sixty-eight, and two in the course of erection.

26. You are acting-secretary?—Yes.

27. How many Inspectors are there under the South Canterbury Board?—One. I may say I am acting in the dual capacity of assistant secretary and Assistant Inspector.

28. You think that the adoption of the proposed scale and the suggested alternative would be a benefit to the teachers of this district?—Yes, a great benefit.

29. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You say that you have sixty-eight schools and two in the course of erection: would all your schools be benefited by the adoption of the proposed colonial scale of staff and salaries?—All except two or three teachers.

30. Are they assistant teachers?—One is a sole head-teacher, and the other two are assistant teachers.

31. Then, on the whole, the suggested scale would benefit the teachers in the South Canterbury District?—Yes, decidedly.

32. Have you had any experience as a teacher in a country school?—Yes; I was five years in charge of the Seadown School, with an attendance of 70 or 80 children. For the first six months I was there as sole teacher.

33. Do you consider that a sole teacher can efficiently teach a school of 40 pupils with all standards?—I do not think a teacher who has just passed his or her apprenticeship would be able to do so. But, generally speaking, a teacher of some experience should be able to manage a school of 40. We find our schools between 30 and 40 very well managed in this district; of course, there are exceptions.

34. Is it not a fact that, with the extension of the freedom of classification and the grouping of classes, a teacher can now efficiently manage more pupils than a few years ago?—I do not think it makes a great deal of difference. If the syllabus were revised there might be a difference, but at present there is not much difference.

35. Then, with regard to the syllabus, would you favour the acceptance of a lower standard of efficiency in country schools where the teacher is not assisted than would be accepted in a large town school fully staffed?—We have not been in the habit of doing so, and we get as good work in the country schools as in the large town schools, generally speaking. I certainly think that in the country schools fewer subjects might be accepted. But I do not see that it would be wise to differentiate in the standard of efficiency required.

36. With regard to the appointment of assistant mistresses, you appoint an infant mistress when the attendance reaches just over 40, and pay her a salary of £60?—Yes.

37. Do you consider that salary of £60 a living-wage?—Not when the teacher lives away from home.

38. What do you consider should be the minimum living-wage?—I really have not gone into that; I would certainly add to the £60, and make it at least £80.

39. You notice that the minimum salary under the proposed alternative scale is £90?—Yes.

40. Do you consider that a sufficient minimum living-wage for an infant mistress?—Yes, it is quite sufficient.

41. I see by your Board's regulations that a female teacher may be appointed to the sole charge of a school of 25 in attendance and upwards?—Yes.

42. Is it considered that a female teacher can efficiently manage a school of 25 in attendance?—Generally we have female teachers in the smaller schools here, and we have one or two male teachers in sole charge, but they are of low certificates, probably just out of their apprenticeship.

43. From your experience as an Inspector, do you find that female teachers can as efficiently discharge their duties in the conduct of small country schools as male teachers?—Yes, I think so; better, in fact, in some cases. But, of course, you must remember that our best male teachers are not in charge of country schools. Up to an average of 30 pupils, and even beyond that number, the female teachers do excellent work.

44. Is it not a fact, in the case of male teachers who have passed their examinations, that many have not yet obtained their certificates, because they have not put in two years' service or got marks from Inspectors, and that that makes them willing to take charge of country schools?—Yes; we have one or two uncertificated teachers in country schools here.

45. I see you pay female teachers 10 per cent. less salary than male teachers?—Yes.

46. Do you invariably find in schools with an average attendance of 20 to 25 that female teachers do the same work as male teachers, and as efficiently?—Yes, they do.

47. Would you propose to pay them equal salaries to males—that is, equal pay for equal work?—It is a question of policy. Up to an average attendance of 25 we pay female teachers the same salaries as male teachers in South Canterbury, but above an attendance of 25 we make a difference. I suppose, up to 25 in attendance the Board considers female teachers as efficient as male teachers. We have one or two country schools in which a female teacher has not the same control as a male teacher.

48. You consider a differentiation in salaries of 10 per cent. sufficient?—Yes, I think it is ample.

49. Do you not consider it preferable that salaries should be paid according to each individual increase in the attendance, as suggested in the proposed scale—that is, if a teacher receives a salary of £127 for 25 pupils he should receive an additional £2 for an additional pupil?—Yes; it might encourage a teacher to use his influence to keep up the average attendance if he was paid so-much a head.

50. Do you consider that for any particular half-day 50 per cent. is adequate in computing the working-average?—I think the payment by the working-average is hardly satisfactory. If it was possible to find a better scheme I think it should be adopted, but I could not suggest a good alternative.

51. Supposing we take a school in which there are 50 pupils on the roll, in order to compute the working-average there must not be less than 25 pupils present on one half-day?—Yes, that is so.

52. Then, for example, if there were 27 or 28 present it would not come into the working-average: do you think 50 per cent. sufficient, or would 60 per cent. or 75 per cent. be better?—It might be an advantage, but there would need to be a safeguard against stuffing the roll.

53. But if the Inspectors were to strictly look out that the rolls were purged it would be an advantage, you think?—Yes.

54. I see your Board pays on the average attendance for the preceding quarter?—Yes.

55. Would it not be better to pay on the preceding two or four quarters?—Yes, it would, because in some cases an epidemic might break out and injure the average attendance of a school for a single quarter. I think, therefore, if the salaries were paid on the average for the whole of the preceding year, teachers would not suffer so unjustly or so much.

56. Have you any difficulty in securing the services of male pupil-teachers?—I cannot say we have had the same difficulty as has been experienced in other districts. According to our present scale, we have twenty-one pupil teachers, and about half of them are males. I have heard of a disinclination on the part of boys to enter the teaching profession.

57. I notice you differentiate between the salaries paid to male and female pupil-teachers?—Yes.

58. Does your Board give preference to female pupil-teachers so that they may teach sewing?—The Board does not take an active part in selecting pupil-teachers. It is generally left to the Committees.

59. And the headmaster, I suppose?—The headmaster has no legal standing in the matter of appointments, though he is generally consulted by the Committees. I think there should be a regulation to the effect of giving headmasters more power in the appointment of pupil-teachers.

60. Would you favour the appointment in a large school of an assistant teacher instead of two pupil-teachers, where practicable?—It depends on circumstances. In some cases it may be preferable to appoint an assistant.

61. Do you consider it advantageous to the economical working of the schools in South Canterbury and the efficiency of the teaching that the sexes should be separated?—The sexes are not separated in any school in South Canterbury.

62. I see you have a regulation that seems to bear on that point?—Yes; they were separated in one school here, but it is not so now.

63. Are you in favour of a superannuation scheme or retiring-allowances for teachers who have grown old in the service of the Board?—I cannot say that I have studied that question sufficiently. I think most of the teachers are insured.

64. Are the incidentals I see on the scale the allowances made to the School Committees or to the teachers?—The incidental allowances made to the School Committees.

65. Do you find that that amount is ample?—Judging by what the Committees say, it is not ample. Those allowances are supplemented in the majority of cases by school concerts, subscriptions, and so forth.

66. Do you grant the same subsidy of 7s. a head irrespective of the size of the school?—No; the amount ranges from 3s. for large schools to 8s. 9d. for small schools. Up to 24 it is 8s. 9d. Between 25 and 300 of attendance it ranges from 8s. 9d. down to 3s., and when the average reaches over 300 in attendance it is 3s. per head for incidentals.

67. Are these residences for the teachers in connection with the schools?—Yes, in all but fifteen cases.

68. I suppose you grant house allowance in those fifteen cases?—Yes; £15 a year is added to the salary of each.

69. What guides the Board in granting anything between £15 and £30?—The size of the school, I should imagine; I do not know exactly. I suppose the members use their discretion.

70. You have not many small schools in the South Canterbury District, so that your Board has not been liberal in the establishment of small schools?—No, we have not many small schools.

71. Do you think that a minimum attendance should be fixed by the central department below which a school should not be established, in order to relieve Education Boards of the pressure brought to bear upon them to establish small schools?—I hardly think such a regulation as that would be wise. In some out-of-the-way places there are two or three families, and the children want educating. If you fixed a minimum attendance of 15 or 20 it would militate against families in such out-of-the-way places receiving the benefits of education. About a year ago we established a school for 12, but those 12 were so situated that it was almost impossible for them to attend a school.

72. What is the cost, according to your last balance-sheet, of the salaries and travelling-expenses of the Inspectors?—£854. That includes Mr. Gow's salary as well as mine. I may point out that all my time is not taken up with inspection, for I have secretarial duties to perform.

73. Supposing we put it at £700, would that be about what it would amount to for inspection?—More than that; £750, at any rate.

74. What grant is given to your Board by the department?—£300.

75. That leaves a balance of £450?—Yes.

76. If the Inspectors were placed under the control of the central department and paid by the department your Board would save about £450?—Yes.

77. Do you consider that Inspectors should be placed under the control of the central department, in order to secure uniformity of examination and Inspectors' marks?—Yes, I think so. Of course, there may be disadvantages; but, on the whole, I think the balance is in favour of Inspectors being placed under the control of the central department.

78. You consider, on the whole, that the adoption of a colonial scale of staff and salaries would secure more stability than that existing at the present time, and that it would be beneficial to the great majority of teachers throughout the colony?—Yes; at any rate, as far as the South Canterbury District is concerned. I cannot speak as to others.

79. Do you consider that a Commission consisting of Education Boards' and teachers' representatives, after taking evidence in the various parts of the colony, would be better able to formulate a scheme of staff and salaries than, as suggested some time ago, a conference of the members of Education Boards?—That is, I think, rather a difficult question to answer.

80. Do you consider that in South Canterbury a system of centralisation could be adopted by which pupils from the outlying districts could be conveyed to a central school, thus doing away

with the establishment of so many small schools?—The Board has attempted that in two or three cases. In one case it was a failure because the people objected strongly to the use of the conveyance. In the case of another school we pay capitation on the average attendance of pupils who come from beyond a certain radius, and this money is used to keep up conveyances. In most cases the parents drive the children to school in their own conveyances. In order to save the building of a new school the Board paid this capitation.

81. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] The whole of the capitation?—A capitation grant of £1.

82. *Mr. Hill.*] Your schools will greatly benefit by the suggested scale?—Yes.

83. The teachers who are employed in your schools will also receive larger salaries than at the present time?—Yes; something like £2,800 a year altogether, including pupil-teachers.

84. Suppose the Government gave the 5s. capitation allowance to the Education Board for distribution among the teachers, have you estimated what would be the benefit?—Yes; about £1,100, roughly speaking.

85. What class of schools do you find the most costly to maintain in your district?—I think the most costly class of school is the school with an attendance of about 40, just where a mistress is appointed.

86. You lose more, really, on that class of school than on the country schools?—I fancy we do; on the spur of the moment I would say we do.

87. Do you require any special qualities on the part of infant mistresses? I see you appoint one here when the average attendance reaches 41, and you call her not the first assistant, but the infant mistress: why do you give her that special title?—Because generally she teaches the infant classes in country schools of an average attendance of from 40 to 80. The headmaster takes Standard III. and upwards, and the infant mistress Standards I. and II. and the preparatory classes.

88. Is she not an assistant in any case in that school?—Yes, in the same sense as an infant mistress in a big school.

89. But why do you discriminate in her case? Cannot the headmaster place her in any position he pleases? Do you recognise his right to do so?—He can do so if he likes, but I do not think it would be a wise step.

90. Supposing in a school the headmaster found it necessary to remove the infant mistress and to substitute another assistant whom he thought more capable of taking charge of the infants, do you think he would not have the right to do so?—I suppose he would; but in any case she is appointed as infant mistress.

91. If she is appointed as infant mistress is she specially qualified for the purpose of performing the duties of an infant mistress only?—I suppose that when she is appointed her qualifications are considered from that standpoint. The Board recognise that a teacher of infants is required, and accordingly appoints the most suitable applicant.

92. *Mr. Hogben.*] In taking into account the increases under the alternative scheme that would be paid to assistants in the South Canterbury District, did you take into account also the statement that accompanied that alternative scheme—viz., that it would afford the means of raising the salaries of all assistants, male and female, throughout the colony to the highest scale of payment now made in any district in the colony?—I did not particularly go into that question. I have assumed that the salaries would be those provided by the first scale.

93. Then, I would point out to you that accompanying this scale was a statement made, laid before the Commission, that the saving effected by the slightly decreased staffing amounted to £4,405, even with the increased salaries given under the alternative scheme; that saving, with £930 added over and above the £4 capitation grant for the whole colony, will enable the salaries of all assistants to be raised to the highest existing scale, such as, for instance, the scale paid in Otago or North Canterbury: are you aware of that?—I did not know that. I took it that the salaries would be paid according to the first scale.

94. Then, the alternative scheme will benefit the South Canterbury District still more?—Yes.

95. With regard to the four assistants you referred to as having reduction in their salaries, are they assistants in large schools?—There are only two assistants whose salaries will be decreased according to the first scheme.

96. Then, according to the alternative scheme, all those deductions will disappear?—Yes.

97. With regard to the question of the deductions on account of low certificates, I understood you to say that you think these certificates should be somewhat modified?—Yes; to expect an E2 certificate in a school of 20 is rather high.

98. Would you go further, and say that it would be better to do away with those deductions on account of low certificates altogether?—No, I would not say that, because I think it is an encouragement for teachers to improve their status—*i.e.*, to improve their certificates—if there is a slight deduction made.

99. When appointments are made, I presume the Board considers the certificates when the applications are placed before them?—Yes, that is the case.

100. The certificates of the teachers have weight in guiding the Board in making appointments?—Yes.

101. Perhaps you think a simpler system could be introduced in which, say, not so high a deduction should be made?—Yes.

102. You expressed an opinion in regard to the number of pupils allotted to a sole teacher, and you agreed, I think, that the limit put in the amended scheme—40 in average attendance—was fair?—Yes.

103. You also expressed an opinion in regard to the syllabus: do you not think it would be better to lessen the number of subjects required in small country schools rathe rthan to allow a lower standard to be reached in the subjects?—Most decidedly. For instance, one effect might be that it would set up a comparison between town and country schools if you differentiated the

standard required, and it might be said of children getting a pass in Standard VI. in country schools that their pass was not so valuable as the pass in Standard VI. in town schools.

104. You think that the standard of "pass" in the pass-subjects should be practically the same in country schools as in town schools?—Yes.

105. With regard to the working-average—the only average existing at present—you stated, I think, that the working-average would be better if taken over an extended period, such as a year, rather than a quarter, and expressed the opinion also that the salaries would not vary so much from time to time, but would remain more constant by so doing?—Yes; the teachers in one of our large schools are suffering because of an epidemic of scarlatina. The average dropped about 30, and those teachers are really doing the same work now as before the epidemic.

106. Supposing the salaries were paid for a year—take a concrete example for the year 1900—upon a colonial scale assumed to have been adopted, would you pay salaries for the whole of the year 1901 on the working-average for the year 1900?—It would be very much better if the salaries were paid on the four previous quarters.

107. Would you approve of an alternative that if the attendance increased the salary should be increased, but that if it decreased the salary should be maintained at not less than a certain limit, so that the teacher should not lose much, and time should be allowed for a transfer to take place?—Yes.

108. With regard to the appointment of pupil-teachers, you stated that the appointment of pupil-teachers was, as a matter of fact, in the hands of School Committees here?—Yes, except that the appoinments are approved afterwards by the Boards.

109. You are aware that the Act does not give Committees any power of being consulted in the matter of pupil-teachers, I suppose?—I have not looked at the Act on that point recently.

110. *The Chairman.*] The practice is for the Board to ratify the appointments?—Yes.

111. *Mr. Hogben.*] I will read the section of the Act [section 50 read]?—In this district the appointment of pupil-teachers was practically in the hands of the Committees, and the Committees in nearly every case were advised by the headmaster.

112. The suggested scale gives higher remuneration for pupil-teachers than the South Canterbury scale?—Yes.

113. Further than that, the suggested scale gives an allowance for pupil-teachers living away from home: there is no allowance made in South Canterbury, is there?—No.

114. As assistant secretary, could you supply to the Commission a statement of the expenditure of the South Canterbury Board for the years 1898, 1899, and 1900, including the items referred to in the form supplied?—Yes.

115. *The Chairman.*] Have you had any difficulty in obtaining a supply of pupil-teachers?—No; I do not remember a single instance where there were no applications for appointment as pupil-teachers. Of course, we have had to take inferior teachers in one or two cases.

116. You have had no complaints from Committees that they were unable to find pupil-teachers?—No.

117. Have you had any trouble in obtaining applications for other vacancies?—In one or two cases where the salaries are low we have had to take teachers inferior to the standard we would expect.

118. Have you ever had to readvertise at any time?—Yes, occasionally.

119. Very often?—Only once during the past year.

120. Do you consider that your schools are staffed in a satisfactory manner?—I think that generally they are fairly well staffed.

121. Are the teachers efficient?—Yes, I think they are very satisfactory. I think the teachers in our large schools compare favourably with the teachers in any school in New Zealand—speaking so far as my knowledge goes.

122. Do you think that the quality of the primary education imparted in the schools in the South Canterbury District is efficient?—Yes, I do.

123. Do the teachers complain of the inadequacy of their salaries?—Yes; they always want more. They compare their salaries with the salaries paid in other districts, and naturally they complain that they are more poorly paid here than in the more fortunate districts.

124. That is the nature of their complaint, then—that they are not paid the same in this district as in other districts in the colony?—Yes.

125. You say that under the alternative scale the salaries would be improved in the South Canterbury District to the extent of something like £2,800 altogether?—Yes.

126. Are the School Committees supplied with sufficient funds for incidental expenses to meet all their requirements?—I do not think so; from my own knowledge, I think they are not.

127. They are in the same position as the teachers, then—not adequately paid?—Yes.

128. You say the funds of the School Committees have to be supplemented by means of concerts and entertainments?—Yes; over and over again.

129. If the amount of money to be paid to the Committees was fixed by a regulation of the Government department, do you think the public would still be as ready to get up entertainments and provide funds?—No; the teachers do that, and I know they would not.

130. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You stated that there are a few teachers in the South Canterbury District who would be prejudicially affected by the adoption of this scheme?—Yes; there would be four head-teachers, I think, and two assistants.

131. Could you name the schools?—Yes; at Cricklewood, Gapes's Valley, Hunter, Clandeboye, and the third and fourth assistants at the Timaru Main School.

132. Would they suffer much reduction?—The four head-teachers would lose £15 8s., and the two assistants £20. I am taking the assistants' salaries on the basis of the first scheme submitted, and the head-teachers' salaries on the basis of the second scheme.

133 That contention will fall to the ground by reason of Mr. Hogben's explanation?—Yes.

134. Do you consider that in a district like South Canterbury, where there are so few teachers who would be prejudicially affected, they would complain of the adoption of a colonial scheme, seeing that it would benefit the great majority of their fellow-teachers? Do you think those two or three school-teachers would act in a dog-in-the-manger manner?—They would object to having their salaries reduced, I suppose.

135. Yes; but do you consider that they would object so far as to oppose the adoption of a colonial scale of staff and salaries, seeing that it would benefit the great mass of their fellow-teachers?—I do not know. I cannot speak definitely.

W. B. Howell, Chairman of the South Canterbury Education Board, examined.

Mr. Howell: I should like to refer to the incidental allowances. I think they are altogether insufficient, and we hope that in the suggested scale there will be a liberal allowance. It seems to me, from what I am able to gather, that very much more than the lion's share of the money available was devoted to the increase of teachers' salaries rather than to keeping up the schools in the manner that should be done.

136. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you in favour of a national system of education for the colony?—Yes, I think so. The present system is patchwork.

137. Do you consider that with thirteen different scales of staff and salaries our system can be as efficiently managed?—No.

138. You consider it is a patchwork system?—Yes.

139. You are in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries for the whole colony?—Yes; but it might be tempered by knowledge I do not possess, such as knowledge as to the cost of living in different parts of the colony.

140. Are you aware that in many districts of the colony a great difficulty is found in getting a suitable class of boys to enter the teaching profession?—No, I am not aware of it. We are running a little low in the supply of material, perhaps, because we found it necessary to curtail the supply several years back. We found they were increasing too fast.

141. Would you be surprised to learn that in every district in which the Commission has taken evidence so far there has been a difficulty in securing a suitable class of boys to enter the profession?—We have not experienced any difficulty so far; of course, I do not know what will happen in the future.

142. How many of your young male teachers left the service recently?—One or two; not many.

143. Have you examined the suggested scale at all?—I have looked at it. I do not consider myself so competent a judge upon it as the teachers would be. Naturally they would criticize a great deal more than I can. What affects me more is the allowances to School Committees.

144. Have you compared the amount allowed for incidentals of School Committees in South Canterbury with the amounts allowed in other districts?—No, I cannot say I have. The proposal will give us an increase, so I am told, of £57, which is a mere bagatelle; we look for hundreds to help us.

145. Do you know that in some districts—Otago, for instance—the allowances to School Committees are supplemented by entertainments, concerts, subscriptions, &c.?—Yes; but I think it is very irregular, and a very paltry way of carrying on and keeping up a national system of education.

146. Do you not think it is wise to encourage the people of the colony to take an interest in the schools and educational matters by having such entertainments?—No, I do not think it is right, especially when you consider that some districts are rich and some are poor. It is unfair, and I disapprove of it. You must consider how the conditions vary in districts. One school may raise £25 easily, and another school might find it extremely hard to raise even £2. I do not think there is any justice in such a course.

147. *Mr. Stewart.*] When you speak of incidentals and the amounts allowed, can you tell the Commission what is done with regard to inside repairs of school-buildings—whether the cost comes out of the incidentals, or whether the Board gets the architect to report, and carry out what is necessary?—All the more costly repairs and painting are done by the Board, but the smaller expenses and repairs are incurred by the School Committees, such as a pane of glass being wanted, or a new lock, or something of that nature.

148. Then, the cost of repainting, the need of additional furniture or new furniture, is incurred by the Board?—Yes.

149. I have in front of me a return with regard to the incidentals for the year 1899. I find in South Canterbury, on looking at the return, that on the average your incidentals amount to 5s. 6d. per head?—Yes, that is so.

150. In Wanganui I find the cost is only 4s. per head, and in Marlborough 5s. 4d., so that your incidentals are not quite so low as in some of the other districts?—Evidently not.

151. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] According to your balance-sheet for 1899, I see you have a credit balance of £1,700?—Yes.

152. You have a credit of £700 on the Building Account?—Yes; that was ear-marked.

153. Have you a credit balance now?—Yes, at this moment; but it is ear-marked too—we cannot spend it.

154. Have you a credit balance on the general fund?—We have not worked out to the end of the year. Whatever there is it is all ear-marked practically, and we need several hundreds more.

155. What about the £1,000 you had to the end of 1899?—It was all ear-marked.

156. With regard to the appointment of teachers, does your Board consult the School Committees in so far as you send in the names of applicants?—Yes, we do that.

157. You generally abide by their recommendations?—No; we send forward our own recommendation.

158. Supposing a School Committee finds fault?—Then they must show reason.

159. With regard to the cost of living in different districts, would you favour a differentiation in the salaries paid to teachers in districts in which the cost of living is exceptionally high—in such districts as Westland and parts of Marlborough?—If it can be proved, I should say so. I think it is only fair-play.

160. With regard to male and female teachers, do female teachers largely preponderate in the South Canterbury District?—There are, I think, sixty-one male teachers and seventy-nine female teachers.

161. Do you experience much difficulty in securing the services of male teachers?—We have not so far. Of course, we have not always a brilliant selection, but we have been fairly well satisfied with what we get.

162. Do you consider that the teachers as a whole in the South Canterbury District are adequately paid for the services they render the Board?—No, I do not think they are; in a good many cases they are not.

163. Do you consider that the adoption of a colonial scale of staff and salaries will benefit the South Canterbury Education District?—It is manifest on the face of it.

164. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you experience any difficulty in dealing with the School Committees in your district?—We have our troubles like other people, but we are not often at loggerheads. They think we are fairly just to them.

165. Would you suggest that they should have more power conferred upon them?—I do not know what direction the increased power could take. I do not think it would be wise for them to have more power in the selection of teachers. They have the privilege of showing grounds for any reasonable complaints they may have in the appointment of teachers, and I do not think they are in the same position to judge as is the Board with the Inspector's help.

166. Do you pay the salaries of the teachers through the Committees or directly?—Directly.

167. Would you widen or limit the powers of Education Boards?—I do not know that I should widen them any more. I think they are fulfilling their useful functions, and we are not anxious to grasp at power. I do not think a very much better system than what obtains at present could be arranged; and, on the other hand, I certainly think it would be a great pity if the Board's powers were curtailed.

168. Do you not think the establishment of a colonial scale of staff and salaries would curtail them somewhat?—I do not think so.

169. Would you suggest that in the establishment of a colonial scale of staff and salaries it would be better to make also a provision for a colonial scale of promotion?—No, it would not do. You have to judge, when you are selecting teachers, by individuals as well as by qualifications. A teacher's power and strength of teaching must be taken into consideration.

170. You prefer the local authority to exercise the choice of teachers?—I think so, decidedly.

171. You think it desirable in the interests of education?—Yes; in the interests of both teachers and children.

172. When considering the appointment of teachers in this district do you advertise for outside applications?—Yes, in important positions which we are not likely to be able to fill from the supply of teachers within our own district.

173. Then, it appears that you do sometimes appoint teachers from outside districts?—Yes.

174. You do not limit the important appointments to purely local men?—No.

175. Has your Board ever found it necessary to expend any of the General Account on the school-buildings?—Yes, we did. During the long course of years we have been in existence we have spent £2,000, but we have reduced that to £1,600. We found, however, we were unable to get on with the necessary buildings and keep that debt hanging over us. It practically meant transferring it from one side of the book to another. The amount provided by the Education Act was never divided into two parts—one for allowances and salaries, and the other for buildings.

176. *Mr. Hogben.*] You have looked at the suggested scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

177. Did you notice the figures on page 4: Under the proposed scale the amount available for Boards' expenses would be £65,303, as against £59,973 according to the present scale; that would give £5,000 odd to be distributed amongst the Boards. Under the scale they would be in as good a financial position as they are now?—Yes; but I understood we should only benefit to the extent of about £50, which would not be anything like the sum we want.

178. You notice that the total amount of benefit would be about £5,400?—Yes.

179. Then, it would be a question as to how best to distribute that amount so as to relieve the Boards?—Yes.

180. If one could devise a better method of distribution than the method merely suggested here it would be advantageous?—Yes.

181. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You approve of a colonial scale?—I am not sufficiently aware as to whether this is a thoroughly good one. I believe in a colonial scale.

182. Do you think a hard-and-fast colonial scale administered by a central authority, when taking into consideration the circumstances arising in connection with schools and school-teachers, could ever be as well managed as a scale administered by the Boards?—I think, on the whole, the teachers would benefit more by a colonial scale administered by a central authority than under scales managed by Education Boards.

183. Do you think a central authority could administer and allocate the various funds now at the disposal of the Boards in as beneficial a manner as the Boards?—The Boards would have a better knowledge of local circumstances, certainly.

184. You think the central authority would be able to manage better than the Boards would, possessing, as the latter do, a knowledge of special circumstances?—I do not know that I can answer that question as well as the teachers themselves can. We do not hanker for the division of the money at all. The Boards certainly possess knowledge of local conditions; but it

would only get us into hot water to take sides, and it is better that the hot water should be at a distance.

185. You look at it, then, not as a matter of the justice of the course, but to avoid unpleasant responsibilities?—No; I really think it would be better.

186. *Mr. Hogben.*] In the case of sickness, do you think it is desirable that there should be a certain time during which a teacher should get sick allowance—that is, that he should receive his salary if away through sickness?—Yes.

187. Does your Board do anything in that direction?—Yes.

188. Does the Board send a relieving-teacher to take the place of a sick absent teacher?—Yes; it provides a *locum tenens*.

189. The Board pays the salary of the relieving-teacher?—Yes.

190. Do you think that in a colonial scale there should be provision for such a fund, out of which the Board should pay in cases of this kind?—Yes.

191. *The Chairman.*] In your opinion, the teachers in the South Canterbury District are inadequately paid?—Yes, as a rule; in a great many cases they are, at all events.

192. You say "a great many cases": then, you would imply that they are not inadequately paid in every case?—No; of course, their responsibilities differ.

193. Do you think salaries rising over £200 are sufficient remuneration for the work?—Yes; it is getting up to a very fair rate of pay. The salaries below that rate stand in more need of levelling-up.

194. With regard to incidental expenses, do you think the schools generally are kept in the order in which they should be kept out of the funds at your disposal?—Some are, and some are not. In cases, without the assistance of entertainments, concerts, and so forth, it could not be done.

195. If there were no concerts and entertainments, do you think the incidental allowances would be sufficient to maintain the upkeep of the buildings?—No; they would go to wreck and ruin. Putting aside the question of incidental expenses, there are lots of our schools that want renovating, painting, and doing up, and we are obliged to simply patch them up.

196. With regard to country schools, are the grounds properly kept and fenced?—Yes; in many cases the fences have been erected at the Committee's expense.

197. Are many of the teachers provided with residences?—Yes, all but fifteen.

198. Headmasters and mistresses of country schools?—Yes.

199. Are the residences taken into consideration in the question of salaries?—Yes; if there are no residences we make house allowance. £15 a year and upwards is added to a teacher's salary for house allowance.

200. The house allowance is included in the scale?—Yes; it would be about £15.

201. Are your assistant teachers provided with residences or house allowance?—No.

202. I suppose some of the male assistants are married men?—Yes.

Rev. G. Barclay, Member, South Canterbury Education Board, examined.

Mr. Barclay: Having listened to the evidence of two or three of the witnesses who have preceded me, I find that some of the points I am interested in have not been touched upon. The first one is in relation to the additional staffing of district high schools. I have carefully looked over this suggested scale, but I notice that no additional staffing is provided for. I think that is a matter that should be provided for, and that there should be additional staffing in district high schools.

Mr. Hogben: I might point out that that is a matter outside the order of reference, and one that will be dealt with separately: the High School Circular makes separate provision.

Mr. Barclay: Well, I think the sums promised are entirely inadequate for the expenses; but I am satisfied with the assurance of the Inspector-General. There is another point I would like to refer to. From time to time there is a great deal of attention drawn to the syllabus, and I am one of those who think that the syllabus might be improved by the addition of a regulation for a Seventh Standard. I find from the returns for the year before last—the latest statistics I have access to just now—that upwards of five thousand children remain in the schools after passing Standard VI. I do not know that the whole of them would remain for any length of time, but I know a considerable portion of them do remain, and in some cases the masters are doing their best to supplement their education. I therefore think that a Seventh Standard should be regularly provided for, and that the syllabus-work for Standard VII. should be an advance upon the subjects in Standard VI., with the addition, perhaps, of one or two secondary subjects, and certainly something in the way of manual and technical instruction suitable to the particular districts. If this were done I am certain that a very large proportion of the five thousand children would remain and receive—for another year, at all events—a very important and useful addition to their education. Of course, the selection of subjects in the Seventh Standard might be left very much to the choice of the parents, in view of the future prospects of the children's employment or profession. One other point I am very much interested in, and that is the working of the School Attendance Act. In this connection I may say that we are very much hampered by the shortness of the radius within which compulsory attendance is necessary. I consider two miles too short, and I think in the case of children up to nine years of age it should be increased to two miles and a half, and for children over nine years of age up to three miles. The Board, with its Truant Officers, has tried to work in accordance with the Act, and the Truant Officers know perfectly well who the defaulters are, and where they are; but they are just outside the radius of the two miles, and in consequence are able to snap their fingers at them. I am certain that if the radius was extended in the direction I have indicated it would be the means of adding to the average attendance of the schools. I should also increase or multiply the penalty for successive violations of the law; I am

not speaking of the £2, but of the fine of 2s. I think the 2s. should be increased to 3s., and on further violations to 4s. and 5s. I, and also others, are very much interested in trying to keep up the average attendance of the schools, and we are extremely sorry because we see so many of the children going about without any education at all. I think that Magistrates should allow costs to Truant Officers. A Truant Officer may travel miles and miles, but on securing a conviction he may get no costs, and he loses perhaps the whole day: there is no incentive for him to do his duty. In regard to the number of attendances, the Act says six out of nine. I would go further than that, and say that out of ten possible attendances there should be eight compulsory; and in an attendance of four two should be compulsory. In regard to the matter of scholarships, I know it depends upon regulations sanctioned by the Government. Sometimes the question is raised here as to where a scholarship-holder may take out his scholarship, and the desire may be, instead of going to a secondary school, to go to special colleges of a practical kind, such as art colleges, mining colleges, or agricultural colleges. In this connection we have been asked to allow our scholarship-holders to go to these other schools.

203. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You can let them go to Lincoln College, can you not?—I cannot say; but, at any rate, the scholarship capitation is so small—1s. 6d.—that without some additional bonus from the Government we could not send a boy to Lincoln College, or any of the art schools. Therefore I think it would be worthy of the consideration of the department to take that matter into consideration, and I think the Government should allow scholarship-holders to be sent to any of these schools. Of course, we might say to a boy, for instance, who has won a scholarship, "Oh, yes, you may go to Lincoln College if you wish"; but what would be the use? We have not the funds to send him.

204. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Regarding the establishment of Standard VII., to which you referred, would you require the establishment of Standard VII. in towns where there are district high schools, or high schools?—If there were district high schools I do not think there would be any necessity.

205. Or where high schools were carried on: I am contemplating the time when the high schools may take up the work from the primary schools and continue it?—I would not object to that at all. We have a school, say, at Pleasant Point, fifteen miles from Timaru, where there is no district high school, and it is in a school of that sort it would be advisable to establish Standard VII., which would serve the purpose, and let the children work up to the top of their bent.

206. You approve of a colonial scale?—In a way.

207. In what way?—From one aspect I approve of it, and from another I do not. I approve of it in the direction of the levelling-up of the salaries of the teachers, but I do not like the idea of the centralisation. I should prefer that the Boards, if possible, discharge their functions as hitherto; but at the same time I must acknowledge that I see a difficulty in that respect. If there is to be one uniform scale it must be settled in one programme and worked from a central department. I have heard observations made about special cases, different districts, the cost of living, and a number of other matters, and from these points of view I should have wished to see the Boards retain their former management, but I do not see how it is to be done practically.

208. Do you think that teachers should be paid on the average attendance or on the roll-number?—On the average attendance.

209. Do you not think that a teacher is responsible for all on the roll?—No, I do not think so.

210. When an Inspector makes his rounds is not the teacher expected to have all on his roll up to the same or a higher standard of efficiency?—I think an Inspector would make due allowance; at any rate, I think it would be a risky thing to pay on the roll-number.

211. In regard to transfer of teachers, do you consider that the Boards should have power to promote and transfer teachers?—Decidedly; we have the greatest difficulty in placing out teachers in suitable positions.

212. With regard to the conveyance of children to a central school, have you found that to be a success in this district?—We have been obliged to resort to it in one or two cases, and in one case it worked exceedingly well.

213. And the method of payment per head, has that been satisfactory?—Every case has to be considered on its merits, and we have to consider the intersection of rivers, and so forth; none are paid for within a radius of three miles.

214. Have you a difficulty in maintaining the line of the three-mile radius?—I do not think so.

215. Do you think it is possible to adopt a system of conveyance beyond a three-mile radius? Yes, if there were no rivers and the roads were good.

216. *Mr. Davidson.*] You stated you approved of a colonial scale of staff and salaries for the colony, I think?—Yes, as a last resource.

217. It would not, in your opinion, weaken the control of Education Boards over the teachers? —I think it would strengthen the control of the teachers over the department in Wellington; that is where the pinch would come in.

218. Would you explain in what way the Boards' control would be weakened?—I do not exactly know. It is not on that side I have any objection; it is on the other side.

219. You do not believe in having thirteen different scales of payment and modes of staffing in the colony?—Hardly.

220. Apart altogether from the teachers and their interests, would it not be in the interests of the children that there should be a uniform scale of staffing for the colony?—Yes.

221. At present the Boards receive the money with which to pay their teachers directly from the department?—I suppose so.

222. If you were assured that it is the intention of the department to pay to each Board the amount of money required to pay its teachers, under a uniform scale, instead of under thirteen different scales as at present, would you be agreeable to such a course?—Yes; but I am not assured.

223. If the powers of the Boards are not weakened, you think it would be in the interests of education to have a good and uniform system of staffing?—Yes.

224. *Mr. Stewart.*] In regard to the conveyance of children to school in relation to the School Attendance Act, supposing there was a means of conveyance up to three or three miles and a half, and that it was brought into relation with the School Attendance Act, do you think that would meet the difficulty?—Yes, I think it would; but I hardly think anything like that could be introduced into the School Attendance Act. One does not know the amount of money it might involve.

225. Do you say that your Resident Magistrates here never allow costs in connection with the Truant Officer's administration?—I never said that they never do so. What I mean is that in all cases they do not.

226. Does your officer apply for costs?—I do not know. I know of the case of an officer in Waimate who, fortunately, by the good opinion and wise judgment of the Magistrate, got costs in his case.

227. With regard to your scholarship regulations, you are aware that the regulations for scholarships as to attendance at schools are made by the Boards, subject to the approval of the Minister of Education: could not your objections on that head be met if the Boards were to submit amended regulations to the Minister of Education?—It is doubtful. The present allowance of 1s. 6d. is insufficient capitation to enable us to carry out what I referred to in my opening remarks.

228. It has been suggested before this Commission that it might be feasible for the Boards to meet in conference and arrange a scale among themselves: do you think it would be feasible?—I think it would be practicable. Of course, you would fail to please everybody.

229. Do you think a scale drawn up as the result of a conference of Boards would be a permanent scale? Do you think it is not likely that in consequence of the changes in the *personnel* of Boards of Education a scale drawn up by them would have no permanency?—I think that if such a learned conclave as the Boards and Inspectors arranged a scale it would not fluctuate very much. The *personnel* of the Boards does not change very much, as a rule; generally it is comparatively permanent.

230. *Mr. Luke.*] Have you many small schools in the Education District of South Canterbury?—Yes; we have sixty-six altogether, large and small, the majority of them being small; only three or four of them can be considered at all large.

231. Did you ever try the half-time system of teaching in those small schools?—No; the schools are not small enough for that.

232. How many junior scholarships do you give a year on the capitation allowance of 1s. 6d. a head?—About a dozen.

233. Are there senior scholarships?—Yes; about one to two junior.

234. To what schools do those go who win senior scholarships?—The secondary schools.

235. With reference to incidental expenses, I suppose the chief expenses are for painting the schools: have you any particular time set down for the painting of the schools?—No; we paint them not so much when they need it as when we have the money. It is part of the business of the Inspector to report what schools stand most in need of painting, and we then try to accomplish the work.

236. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long have you been a member of the South Canterbury Board?—Since it came into existence.

237. Consequently you have a good deal of practical experience as to the working of the Board?—Yes.

238. Would you be in favour of the amalgamation of the South Canterbury Education District with the North Canterbury District?—Not at all.

239. Do you not consider that there are too many of these small education districts in the colony?—I do not know about Marlborough and Taranaki, and these outlandish places—no offence intended, of course—this is not superfluous. We had an experience of the North Canterbury Board before we got a division, and we gladly washed our hands of it.

240. You would not be able to pay a capitation of £5 if it were not for the larger class of schools you have?—Certainly not.

241. Is there no reason why the large schools in North Canterbury should not contribute towards the cost of the small schools in South Canterbury?—Well, we would be glad to receive the money.

242. You do not know definitely whether you are in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—I think I expressed myself that in one aspect I was, and in another I was not. I really see no other way out of the difficulty than by a colonial scale.

243. Could you tell the Commission how often since the South Canterbury Board has been established it has adopted a new scale of staff and salaries?—Unfortunately, many times, in consequence of the way the Government treated us in the amounts of the annual grants. In the first place, we received £3 15s. capitation and 10s. a head for incidentals. The latter was afterwards reduced to 5s., the next reduction was to 4s., and then the whole was swept away. We were thus obliged to reconsider our scale and bring everything down. We asked the Government on one occasion, after they completely swept away the incidental fund, what we were to do, and we were told to take what we needed out of the maintenance fund—out of the £3 15s.; but I thought that should be solely for the maintenance of teachers, and should not be tampered with.

244. Was the general tendency of the Board to reduce the salaries of the teachers?—Yes; there was no help for it. The scale had to be altered, and, of course, the salaries likewise.

245. Is it probable that you are going in for further reduction in the near future—that is, in the absence of a colonial scale?—I hope not. I trust a colonial scale will be a solution of the difficulty.

246. Seeing that there are thirteen educational districts in the colony, and that each district is doing very much the same as the South Canterbury Board has been compelled to do through financial straits—reduce their scales—would not a colonial scale have more stability about it than to have these numerous scales?—Yes; but it depends on the stability of the department and the Government.

247. If a colonial scale is adopted, seeing that we are limited to a £4 capitation grant in drawing up the scale, will that not disappear, and Parliament vote a lump sum to meet the expenses of teachers' salaries?—I do not know what Parliament will do. I should be personally glad if a definite limit were reached at once. I think it would save a great many contingencies. I suppose Parliament will say, "Here is a scale that costs so-much," and they will then vote the amount.

248. Do you think the adoption of a colonial scale would minimise the exercise of Boards' control over their teachers?—I do not think so. I do not think they are, as a rule, very ambitious for great control over teachers.

249. As a member of the Board, you would not insist on the maintenance of the present system, seeing that the proposed scale will be beneficial to the teachers in this district?—Not at all.

250. You consider that the two-mile radius is not sufficient for compulsory attendance in South Canterbury?—I do not think it is.

251. Would you be in favour of a three-mile radius in districts such as South Canterbury, and a two-mile radius in bush districts like Taranaki and Auckland, where there are bad bush-tracks, and two miles would mean as much travelling to the children there as what three miles would be in this and similar districts?—I think it would be somewhat difficult to differentiate. I do not see that two limits could be fixed; I think there should be one uniform radius, and that the Board should exercise its discretion.

252. Do your finances not allow you to secure the services of a Truant Inspector?—We have a staff—one man could not work this district; we divide the district into six or seven centres, and we get a local man in each with a special knowledge of the particular district to which he is confined.

253. Is it not a fact, then, in such cases that a local man would be more likely to be lenient to local defaulters than an officer under the central department?—I do not think so.

254. In regard to the School Attendance Act, you complain that the Magistrates do not give costs?—I do not mean to imply that they never give costs; on various occasions they are not given, and we are disappointed in consequence. We think it is a discouragement to the Truant Officer.

255. With regard to the transfer of teachers, does the South Canterbury Education Board transfer teachers from one district to another?—I hardly think we know anything about transfer—in the ordinary sense—of teachers from school to school. I should be glad if we had the power to do so. We follow the usual course, and that is, if a teacher resigns, the names of the applicants for the position are submitted in manner I stated before.

256. Does your Board endeavour to promote its own teachers when a suitable opportunity occurs for promotion? If the first assistant in one of your large schools resigns, do you promote the second assistant to his position?—We advertise and go through the usual routine.

257. Do you consider outside applications?—Yes, when the standard of applicants from our own district is not sufficiently high.

258. Did your Board ever pass a resolution to boycott outside applicants?—No, never.

259. Do you experience any difficulty in obtaining the services of trained teachers?—My impression is that in the majority of cases we get teachers who have been in the employ of Boards, and have therefore gained experience in schools. I do not know that we give preference to teachers who have had special training in the colleges.

260. When your pupil-teachers have finished their course have you any opportunity of sending them to the training-colleges?—No.

261. Do you not consider that the four training-colleges—one in each of the four centres—should be placed under the control of the department?—I do not know; I think that they should be subsidised. I understand that they are very well managed, and therefore I think they should be entitled to special assistance from the Government.

262. That the Government should solely maintain them?—I do not say that.

263. Would you favour facilities or inducement for pupil-teachers, by way of scholarships or allowance for board and lodging, in order to allow them to attend training-colleges to receive training in cases where there may be no normal schools in their own particular districts?—Yes; for instance, that the Christchurch Normal School should stand in a common relation to the whole of the district, north and south.

264. Would you favour a scheme of superannuation or retiring-allowance for those teachers who have been in the employ of Boards for a long time, say, at the age of sixty or sixty-five?—I would not object to it any more than the old-age-pension scheme. I would certainly like to see a system to which the teachers should themselves contribute. I think there are many teachers imprudent and improvident, and such a plan would help to develop their thrift.

265. How much could they contribute in South Canterbury, do you think, out of the salaries paid them; or do you consider that they should be called upon to pay towards such a fund in a district like this, where their salaries are so poor?—They could at present ill spare it, but if this new and liberal scale was introduced they could then spare something towards the fund.

266. *Mr. Hill.*] Have you many children who have passed the Sixth Standard in your small schools?—I think there is a very fair proportion. The Inspector will tell you better than I can.

267. Are the teachers in country schools capable of taking up the work of subjects for Standard VII., such as you suggested in your opening remarks?—I think the majority of them would be.

268. Do you think it would tend to foster the supply of those teachers in the country if some grant were given to them for taking up Standard VII. subjects?—Yes; and it would add to their prestige, and tend also to all-round equality and efficiency.

269. Does the Timaru High School admit all scholarship-holders free?—Yes.

270. Are the country holders admitted in the same manner?—Yes; there is no restriction.

271. Have you made application for the admittance of those who have passed through Standard VI.?—No.

272. Do you think it would tend to benefit education if promotion of that sort were allowed to the Standard VI. pupils to continue their education in the high schools of the colony?—Yes; but it would require a larger endowment to the high schools, or an extra capitation grant for the additional staffing required.

273. Do you admit to the high school pupils below Standard VI.?—I think there were some admitted at an early stage.

274. You do not admit them now?—I cannot answer that.

Mr. Hogben: I might point out that the return from the High School Board last year showed that there were three—one who had not passed Standard V., and two who had not passed Standard VI.

275. *Mr. Hill.*] You approve of a colonial scale, or the principle of a colonial scale?—Yes.

276. *Mr. Smith.*] I understand you have been a member of the South Canterbury Board many years?—Yes.

277. Do you think that the Inspectors should be placed under the control of the department instead of as at present; also that they should be paid by the department independently of the Boards?—I do not see the advantages.

278. Does your Board invariably consult the Inspectors in matters requiring expert knowledge, such as, for instance, the staffing of the schools, and the establishment of new schools?—Yes, decidedly; as a rule, the Inspector is sent out to examine the district, and report.

279. Do you know of any case where any Board has acted contrary to the opinions of an Inspector?—I do not know; such has not been the case in this district, at any rate.

280. *Mr. Hogben.*] You notice that the suggested scale implies an improvement on the whole of the staffing of the schools of the colony?—Yes.

281. It implies, in the first case, an increase by 322 on the number of adult teachers, and a decrease by 244 on the number of pupil-teachers: that would tend largely in the direction of efficiency, would it not?—Yes.

282. Putting on one side the money question, you think that the schools in the colony would benefit?—Yes. There is one point I have not gone into: You propose a reduction from 1,022 to 778 throughout the colony, and, as far as our Board is concerned, I do not know how that proposed reduction would act; we did reduce a proportion of our pupil-teachers some time ago, and I think the present proportion is 4·6 adults to one pupil-teacher.

283. With regard to the School Attendance Act, and one or two other matters to which you referred, did you read the report of the Conference of Inspectors held this year?—I am afraid I did not give it very close attention.

284. I was going to ask you whether you read the statement made by myself as Chairman, and the debate that took place on the question of Standard VII. being established?—Yes, I did, and I approved of it.

285. You are aware that I announced that in all probability a new School Attendance Bill will be introduced next Parliament?—Yes; and I was very glad to hear that also.

286. You are of the opinion that the appointment and dismissal of teachers is better carried out by the Education Boards than by the central department?—Yes, decidedly.

287. And that it would be better not to have a colonial system of promotion for the reason that it would involve interference with the Boards' discretionary powers?—Yes.

288. If a colonial scale was established, do you consider that there would be a greater tendency on the part of teachers, when suitable vacancies occurred, to interchange from one district to another?—Yes; there would be more inclination if the salaries and other conditions were suitable. There would be a freer interchange.

289. With regard to the staffing of district high schools, you have read the District High School Circular of the 9th January?—Yes, I have.

290. What would be the amount a secondary class of a district high school with an attendance of 20 would receive in addition to the capitation of £3 15s. per head?—I must confess that there is a good deal of doubt as to our interpretation of the document, and I am not prepared to answer the question.

291. Are you aware that, besides the £3 15s. grant, in schools of 20 pupils fulfilling the conditions laid down the amount received would be £120, a capitation of £6 per pupil?—Some interpret it more liberally than others do. In regard to incidental allowances and other points in the Board's finances, I have a document in my hand showing certain details. It shows that Boards, in consideration of something, are to be paid £250 and a capitation of 11s. 3d., which, I suppose, is meant to provide for incidentals. I wish to show you how that will affect us in our own schools. I quote from the last annual report. On 4,388 we received £16,500, and we paid £14,617 in salaries, leaving a balance of £1,883; for the Inspector we got £300; a subsidy from the Waimate High School of £100; £184 District High School fees; and other little driblets amounting to £50; in all, a total of £2,517. It was disbursed as follows: Office staff, £311; Inspector, £678; departmental contingencies amounting to £195; examination of pupil-teachers, £42; scholarship examination, £66; incidentals, £1,197; which leaves us with only a balance of £28. The capitation of 11s. 3d. brings in something like £2,440, and that with the £250 extra, would total £2,790, on which we might struggle along. There is no natural limit to the asking on the part of Committees, and there is really no actual limit to their alleged wants. Constant applications come

in, and it is very painful to have to refuse them so often. I venture to suggest that you should raise the capitation from 11s. 3d., to 13s. which would enable us to pay about another £250; that would be a very great help to us, and would stop a great deal of grumbling that goes on at the present time on the part of the Committees.

292. *The Chairman.*] You think that if the salaries of the teachers are to be raised the allowances to School Committees should be raised at the same time?—Yes.

293. The one is as indispensable as the other?—Yes.

294. Do you consider that the present system of education is a truly national one?—I suppose it is; it is national in so far as there is one syllabus.

295. It is a national system of education?—Yes, with little internal diversities.

296. And the mere alteration of the payment of teachers by the central department instead of by Boards is not going to alter the national system, you think?—I would not say that it would denationalise it.

297. You say that you are in favour of a colonial scale because it will reduce inequalities that now exist, and bring about something like uniformity in the salaries of teachers all over the country?—Yes; but the chief fascination for me is not the matter of the uniformity of the salaries of teachers, but the levelling-up.

298. Would you like to see the teachers in other districts brought down to the same level as South Canterbury?—That would be the lowest level; it would not do.

299. You want the salaries paid to teachers in the South Canterbury District levelled up?—Yes; if they were as high as Otago we would be satisfied.

300. Do you wish to level up the salaries all round?—I do not say that, because my impression is that some of the salaries paid in the districts with large schools are pretty good, and it is so in consequence of those large schools.

301. At all events, you want to remove inequalities?—Yes, as far as possible.

302. What salaries do you think chiefly require levelling up?—It is a big question. For myself, I consider that this Board has all along been paying very great consideration to the smaller schools: the first proposed scale does not suggest any increase at all to many of these smaller schools. With regard to the larger schools, we have some teachers of very high attainments who have had very successful careers, and the salaries they receive do not bear comparison with the salaries paid to teachers in North Canterbury and Otago.

303. What will be the financial aspect if the amount proposed, about £3,000, is added to the teachers' salaries in this district, and if the salaries all over New Zealand are raised to a corresponding level?—I do not think a £4 capitation will meet it.

304. You mean that it would largely increase the cost?—Yes, I do. Some of the Committees are very liberal, and try to help us as much as possible; while others do not help at all, and many of the latter are Committees of the largest schools in the province.

305. The great bulk of your teachers here are receiving under £150 a year?—Yes; but there are only nine or ten schools of any magnitude.

306. Do you think the smaller schools at the present time are efficiently staffed?—I am sure we give them as liberal a staffing as we can possibly afford. I am not aware of any case that is understaffed.

307. Do you think it fair that efficient and experienced teachers are confined to the towns, and the comparatively raw teachers are left in charge of the small schools in the country?—It is not a question of "raw" teachers; it is a matter of the salary paid to them.

308. I mean inexperienced teachers?—We have to take the teachers that are available. I am not aware that we have many inexperienced teachers.

J. G. Gow, M.A., Inspector of Schools, examined.

Mr. Gow: I think in South Canterbury we have very litttle reason to be otherwise than satisfied with the proposed introduction of a colonial scale of staff and salaries. It would be an advantage to almost every individual teacher in the district. You are aware that this is one of the smaller districts that has a good many schools of the kind that are very expensive to keep up. We have about twenty schools with an average attendance of from 40 to 90, and each of these schools requires two teachers. With us it takes a school with an average attendance of about 60 to pay for itself. We have only fourteen schools with an average of from 59 upwards that are really schools that pay their way, and most of these schools pay very little in excess. There is very little left, after the salaries and incidentals are paid, to yield anything for the carrying-on of the smaller schools. That will explain to some extent the reason why the South Canterbury District has a somewhat bad name on account of the smallness of the salaries paid to its teachers; but you will see that it is simply a question of cutting our coat according to our cloth. I should like to say something about the certificates demanded in the proposed scale. From 1 to 14 in attendance an E5 certificate is required. I have no very strong opinion on that matter, except that an E4 certificate is, in my opinion, sufficient.

Mr. Hogben: I might point out that an E5 certificate is required in schools with an average attendance of from 14 to 19: do you notice that?

Mr. Gow: Well, I consider that in schools of from 14 to 19 an E4 certificate is sufficient; from 14 to 25 I should say an E3 or D4. One who has been a good pupil-teacher and has passed examinations well, and has taken a D certificate, should be quite capable of managing that class of school. In schools of from 25 to 40 I should still keep the D4, or an equivalent, E3; from 40 to 75, D3; from 75 to 250, D2; from 250 to 600, D1; above that class of school, with an average attendance of over 600, it might be better, perhaps, to appoint a teacher with a certificate of C1, and these schools might be reserved as prizes. In the list of certificates required of infant mistresses in the schools of over 250 in attendance a D2 is demanded, and over 600 a D1. It

might be advisable in the future to tell young people who are being trained for the profession that a D would be expected for those positions. We have in our service now several female teachers who have peculiar qualifications as infant mistresses. They have all the vivacity and sympathy with child-nature, and also the skill in teaching, that are necessary to make infant-schools successes. They have had long experience in the service, but unfortunately they have an E certificate. I do not think, therefore, that there should be any deduction made from those who have held the positions for some time, even though the certificate is an E. In fact, I might point out to the Commission that one of the best infant mistresses in the colony is in a large school here—the Timaru Main School—and her certificate is an E1. She has had a Home training in schools in England, and thirteen or fourteen years' experience in our own schools. Leaving the question of certificates, I might say that I feel satisfied that under the second scheme—the alternative scheme —the assistant first added to the staff is recognised as an infant mistress. We have under our own scale for years past recognised that the holder of this position is entitled to be called "infant mistress." We have only one school with two certificated teachers where the head is a female teacher. Under the first scale it was proposed that in some cases the head should be a mistress and the assistant should be a male. I do not know whether in the alternative scheme that is departed from altogether, but I certainly think it is objectionable.

Mr. Hogben: I might point out that it has been withdrawn.

Mr. Gow: With regard to the staffing of the schools, I approve of the first assistance coming in at an average attendance of over 40, and I might point out that our own scale coincides with that. Of course, it means that for an average attendance of 41 to be maintained there will be something like 50 or 52 names on the roll, so that the appointment of two teachers for an average attendance of 41 would practically mean two teachers for 50 or 52. I might say that there is one phenomenal case in our district where there are 43 names on the roll and the average attendance is 42. I might also point out that in this district the full advantage in regard to teaching-power cannot be derived from having two teachers in schools with an average of 41, for the reason that we have not two rooms in every school where we have two teachers. We have eight one-roomed schools in each of which two certificated teachers are employed. To get the full advantage of the teaching-power employed it will be necessary to build an addition to these schools—to have at least two rooms instead of one. With the limited finances at the disposal of the South Canterbury Education Board, I have never felt that I could advise the Board to build in these cases, although I think it very necessary; and I should like to advise that there should be more money available in order to do this necessary building. Looking at the staffs of the schools as a whole, I find very little difference to be made in our district in the number of teachers. According to our scale we employ 115 certificated teachers and twenty-one pupil-teachers. According to the second scheme there would be 119 certificated teachers—an increase of only four; with twenty-six or twenty-four pupil-teachers, according to the way in which it is read—whether the first proposal is to be read in conjunction with the second proposal.

Mr. Hogben: It means one less all the way down.

Mr. Gow: Our proportion of adult teachers to pupil-teachers is 4·6 adults to one pupil-teacher. There has been a good deal said to-day about the question of pupil-teachers and the employment of male and female teachers. We have in our service at the present time eleven male and thirteen female pupil-teachers. I am not aware that there has been any great difficulty in inducing male pupil-teachers of a good stamp to come forward in this district. I should say we have had some of exceptional ability—boys who have had a good training in the district high schools before beginning their work. But we should not be surprised if they had not come forward in satisfactory numbers, because when their apprenticeship is over there is very little chance of their finding employment. Our girl pupil-teachers find employment at once, because we have so many schools that employ female assistants; there are 20 schools between 40 and 90, and this means that there are twenty places for which only female teachers are eligible. The only positions open for boys after they have served their apprenticeship are the lower assistantships in schools such as Timaru, Temuka, and Geraldine. I regret that there is no provision in the scale for special payment for the instruction of pupil-teachers, for that would add to the teacher's interest in the work of instruction of the pupil-teacher. In South Canterbury we give payment for more than the special training of the pupil-teacher; we give a bonus on the passing of the pupil-teacher. Another matter I think that requires attention is the establishment of training-colleges for teachers. Our teachers get a good training in the practical working of the schools, but they have not the opportunity of attending training-colleges; and I think it would be advisable that some scheme should be drawn up by which they could be assisted to go to some central training-college. I do not approve of the alteration of male and female teachers throughout the larger schools. In the large schools I think that all the teachers who will have to do with the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards should be males, because the strain generally is too great for a young woman to be able to stand for any length of time. As a matter of fact, the headmasters in our own schools have found it advisable to place a male teacher of a lower rank—say, the fourth assistant—in charge of the Fourth Standard, and the female teacher thus superseded, although higher on the staff, has had to take a lower class. That has happened at Waimate and Timaru, and last year it happened at Temuka. It was a good thing to do that; but these male assistants are, of course, getting less pay though teaching the higher standard, and they might have had some feeling as to the fairness of their treatment. It has been said that the larger salaries paid in some districts attract to those districts all the best teachers of the colony. I have to say for my own district that the headmasters of our larger schools—from 120 up to that of the largest school—will compare most favourably with the best headmasters I know of in any centre of the colony. Some of the best men are blocked in these other districts, and have to go to the smaller districts to get headmasterships.

309. *Mr. Davidson.*] On the whole, you are satisfied with the suggested scale of staffs and salaries in the alternative scheme?—Yes.

310. What is your opinion of the certificate required for the position of first assistant in schools of from 250 to 600?—I should prefer D2 for that position.

311. By the proposed scale D3 is required for a first assistant up to 600, but immediately the school passes beyond that a certificate of B2 is required: do you approve of the certificate there?—No. If he has his degree, that gives him B, and that in itself is a great factor in getting employment; but I do not think it is essential that a man should have a degree.

312. What difference would the suggested scale make in the largest school in this district as far as staffing is concerned?—In the largest school it would give one additional assistant.

313. What is the present number of adult teachers in that school?—Eight.

314. Do you think that in the interest of education the staff should be strengthened to that extent?—Yes.

315. *Mr. Stewart.*] Looking at this matter from the point of view of the advantage of the whole colony, do you think there ought to be a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes.

316. Quite apart from the advantage gained by your own Board?—Yes.

317. Do you find that the exclusion of days on which there are less than half the roll-number present materially assists in excluding the low-attendance days from the computation of the average?—It assists to a considerable extent in the country schools, but has little effect in the larger schools.

318. It has been suggested to the Commission in various centres that it would be a just and a wise thing, instead of one-half, to make it less than three-fifths or less than two-thirds; what is your opinion about that suggestion?—I think it might be three-fifths. But even that would not make any difference in the city schools. It is very seldom they come down to 60 per cent.

319. Do you think it would be inadvisable to raise it to three-fifths instead of less than one-half?—I do not think it would be inadvisable. It may be of some relief to country teachers.

320. *Mr. Luke.*] Does your Board keep the teachers on after they have passed their pupil-teachership?—If their apprenticeship terminates during the year they are allowed to remain on till the end of the year, so that they may be instructed further in the subjects necessary for taking their E or D certificates. So far as the girls are concerned, we have have no difficulty in placing them, but we do not keep them on after the end of the year. Some of the boys, as soon as they have finished their apprenticeship, have had to go out, and have drifted into other employment. I know one or two in Timaru who have had to do that.

321. But, supposing they have got their certificates, do you keep them on as ex-pupil-teachers? We find in Auckland that the ex-pupil-teachers do capital work in the schools?—We would keep them on if we had places for them. We know their value, but we have no places for them.

322. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider that the teachers in South Canterbury are inadequately remunerated?—Up to the present time, yes.

323. And you consider that the adoption of a colonial scale something akin to this would materially benefit the teachers in this district?—It would.

324. With regard to the certificates, do you consider that E4 should be the lowest minimum for the lowest schools up to 19?—E3 or D4.

325. And in schools of from 19 to 35 D4?—Yes.

326. And in schools up to 250 D2?—Yes.

327. And up to 600?—D1.

328. And above 600 C1?—Yes.

329. Do you approve of the reduction of £10 from the teacher's salary to pay the sewing-mistress?—No.

330. You do not consider that the sewing-mistress is of any assistance in lightening the work of a sole teacher in a country school?—No, for the male-teacher is still teaching while the sewing is going on, and I think, if the man is unmarried, it will be too bad to take £10 from him; and, if he is married, I think his wife would be inclined to say, "I would like to earn £10 myself, and not have it taken from my husband's salary."

331. Do you not think that 41 is rather early to have any assistant in a school: would teachers not prefer to teach schools up to 45 and receive better pay rather than have the schools over-staffed and receive lesser pay?—I do not think they were consulted.

332. What would their opinion be if they were consulted?—It is for the Board to consider what is best for the schools.

333. Does your Board give preference in the appointment of pupil-teachers to females on the understanding that they will teach the sewing?—No.

334. Do you think that the salaries proposed to be paid to pupil-teachers are adequate?—Yes, I think they are fair.

335. And you consider that male and female pupil-teachers should be paid the same salary?—Yes, at that stage I think they might.

336. Do you consider that a teacher who is already in a position should be fined or penalised to the tune of 1 per cent. or 4 per cent., as the case may be, because he does not hold the minimum certificate?—I think consideration should be given to those already in positions.

337. And even were the new scale brought into operation it should operate detrimentally on those teachers, but only have effect when fresh appointments are made?—Yes.

338. Would you, then, favour a bonus or grant to teachers who have a higher certificate than what is required?—No; they are sufficiently rewarded by having the better chances of securing appointments.

339. Do you approve of side-schools?—We had one in Timaru, and the experience we had of that would lead me to say I would not approve of side-schools.

340. Do you consider that there is too large a gap between the salary proposed to be given to the headmaster of a town school and that to the first assistant, seeing that the headmaster has a free house and the assistant has not?—I have not looked at it from that point of view, but I think the headmaster deserves a good salary.

341. Do you favour a scheme of superannuation?—Yes.

342. I suppose you are one of the Inspectors who attended the last conference, which by a majority passed a resolution in favour of the centralisation of Inspectors?—Yes.

343. Are you in favour of the unification of the education system whereby the secondary schools and the university, by means of bursaries, exhibitions, and scholarships, may be made stepping-stones for the brightest and best pupils of the primary schools?—I am in favour of a scheme of that kind.

344. *Mr. Hill.*] Assuming that you approve of the staffing according to the proposed scale, do you think that the power should be left in the hands of the Boards to modify it according to the needs of any school or district so long as there is an equivalent?—I am afraid that is going back to the Boards arranging their own staffs. I can understand an equivalent of this kind: that one assistant might be allowed for two pupil-teachers, or something of that kind. It is a question that might be considered by the Board on account of the building or the accommodation of a school.

345. Do you not think that if this scale were adopted as submitted it would lead possibly to serious trouble in the case of those who do not hold the necessary certificates—that there might be a great turning-out of teachers not up to the mark?—Yes.

346. Do you not think there is a likelihood of Committees complaining to Education Boards of teachers who do not hold the necessary certificates?—There might; but I do not know to what extent it would apply.

347. Do you not think that free competition in the matter of appointments would work just as well?—I do not think there would be much harm in having no mention of certificates at all. I have not considered the question in that light before; but it might lead to different Boards setting up different standards of certificates for the same grade of school.

348. What is your opinion as to the centralisation of Inspectors?—I gave my vote at the Inspectors' Conference. I was better pleased with the way Mr. Gilfedder put the question to me.

349. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] What is your rule here in the matter of sick-pay?—We give full pay for one week, and half-pay for five weeks.

350. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] What is the pay for the holidays here: is it the same as the preceding pay for the teacher?—We take twelve months in the year and pay them monthly salaries.

351. Would you like to make the basis of payment the working-average or the roll.number?—The working-average.

352. *Mr. Hogben.*] You are aware that no special payment for the instruction of pupil-teachers is made in Auckland or Otago?—No; I have not studied the question from that point.

353. Take the matter of allowing an assistant to be substituted for two pupil-teachers: if you made a special payment for the instruction of pupil-teachers the headmaster's salary would be reduced in that case, would it not?—Yes, certainly.

354. It would be on the headmaster's advice that the change was made?—Yes.

355. It would be asking him to give advice to lessen his own salary?—The Board might not put him in that position, but might do it on the advice of the Inspectors.

356. Is it fair to put a headmaster in that position?—No, I do not think so.

357. Then, again, if you diminish the number of pupil-teachers you set the headmaster free to do work in other ways?—The tuition of pupil-teachers is generally done before or after school-hours.

358. But he prepares for the tuition of the class-pupils out of hours, and in that way just as much work might be got out of him as if there were more pupil-teachers?—Yes.

359. If the amount is added to the income, do you think any injustice is done, or do you recommend it on the ground of expediency?—It has grown to be a custom here, and I looked at it from that point of view—that it may give a man more interest in his pupil-teachers when he is getting special pay for it.

360. Do you know any Australian Colony where it is done?—No; but if it is a good thing to do here it might be a good thing to do in the whole of the colony.

361. Would you like to see the Commission recommend the abolition of the reduction to teachers holding lower certificates?—I do not think those in the service now should be fined for holding certificates lower than those required by the scale.

362. If the money could be saved, do you think it would be advisable to retain the deductions, or simply to take away the rule providing for deductions and allow certificates to have their own weight in appointments?—I should like to see deductions done away with altogether.

363. In your opinion, I suppose, it would take some time to bring a scale into operation without dislocation to the schools?—Yes.

364. Do you think that four years would be a reasonable time to allow as an extreme limit—four years being the time of a pupil-teacher's apprenticeship?—I should say that four or five years would be a sufficient time, but it is a matter I have not previously considered.

365. That should be enough, as it allows the pupil-teacher's time to work fully out?—Yes.

366. If you had training-colleges with studentships open to the best pupil-teachers, do you think it would still be necessary to supplement the work of such training-colleges by providing instruction for such pupil-teachers as could not gain studentships?—Yes; I think that might be done in some centres by providing classes. Those who could go to the training-colleges would doubtless benefit from it in after-life because of the extra tuition they had received.

367. *The Chairman.*] I think you say it is not imperative that pupil-teachers should attend any course in a training-college before qualifying for teachers?—It is a question of expediency, and whether the colony is able to support the full number at the training-colleges.

368. Would it not be necessary to have training-colleges established at all the centres?—Something less than training-colleges might be aimed at.

369. Do you think it would be fair to the country boys and girls that any training of this kind should be required at their hands?—Yes; I think, if they want to make themselves quite fitted for the profession, that they ought to be authorised to go to some such college.

370. But under the present system do the pupil-teachers who have not attended training-colleges turn out failures afterwards?—No; but I would have them made even better men and women than they are just now.

371. Training in a training-college is not absolutely necessary to their being good teachers?—No.

372. Is there not something required beyond what they receive in a training-college to make a boy or girl a good teacher?—There is such a thing as natural aptitude.

373. Is not natural aptitude superior to anything else than can be imparted?—That is rather a difficult question. A man may begin by having apparently very little aptitude for the profession, and yet by skilful training he may be made a very successful teacher.

374. Do you think the national system of education is improved by precluding boys and girls from the country from obtaining situations in the profession?—They are not at present precluded.

375. No; but there is the proposal to alter the present system by requiring them to be trained specially?—I do not know that there is any proposal to that effect.

376. Do you not think that the abolition of the bonus system that you have in this district would lead virtually to the prevention of pupil-teachers in the country qualifying themselves?—No, it would have no effect in that way.

377. Do you think teachers without the bonus would be willing to take the same amount of trouble in preparing pupil-teachers that they do now?—Those teachers who have apprentices devote themselves to the teaching of the apprentices, and I think they would do it all the better because they have the bonus.

378. Would not the abolition of the bonus very much interfere with the instruction?—It might affect it to some extent.

379. Have you found any trouble in getting sufficient pupil-teachers for your schools?—No; we generally have a good many candidates waiting in each school, and the average age at which our pupil-teachers begin their work is very high.

380. What is the age?—From fifteen to seventeen.

381. You say you get a fair number of male pupil-teachers?—We get almost an equal proportion.

382. But you say you are apt to lose your male pupil-teachers after they have passed their apprenticeship, because they drift into other employment?—We have had instances of that kind.

383. What is the proper corrective of that?—By increasing the number of assistants in large schools is one way, and by increasing the pay.

384. Which remedy do you think would be the most effective—the most permanent?—I think the increased pay would be the most effective inducement.

385. What teachers have you generally in charge of country schools—male or female?—In schools under 30 there are twenty-five females and five males.

386. Do you think the schools could be better staffed than now?—The larger schools would do with an extra assistant each.

387. Have you been losing any of your best teachers through departure to other districts?—No.

388. Are your headmasters in the habit of leaving you?—No; but, taking the changes generally, there is only one headmaster of a school now who was headmaster of that school when I came here fifteen years ago.

389. If the salaries are insufficient, what class of salaries require levelling up chiefly?—The salaries of the assistant mistresses in some of the larger schools require bringing up.

390. In making appointments in the large schools, do you think any hard-and-fast rule should be laid down regarding the appointment of males and females?—I think so, for the sake of the ladies themselves.

391. Is it not found sometimes desirable by the headmaster to make a change in the position of his teachers by putting an assistant in charge of a lower class than the one to which he was appointed?—If he did that he might almost have gone a step further, and put him out altogether.

392. Do you know where a headmaster has exercised his discretion in that way?—No.

393. Do you not think a headmaster should have full power to place his staff as he thinks best for the school?—Yes.

394. Do you think that Inspectors desire to be placed under a central department because they wish to get away from their particular Board?—If they had all had a Board like the South Canterbury Board I do not think they would want to get away to another.

395. Can you give us any idea of what really actuated the majority of the Inspectors in coming to that conclusion?—I dare say it would be partly the thought that there would be larger salaries and a likelihood of a stronger tenure of office.

J. A. Johnston, M.A., Headmaster Timaru Main School, and Representative of the South Canterbury Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Valentine will deal broadly with the figures of the scale, and Mr. Kalaugher represents the small schools. I have been left to deal with the matter generally. We have no

representatives of the assistants here, and no representatives of the female teachers. As far as I can make out, all the teachers in South Canterbury are more or less satisfied with the proposed new scale. We have therefore very little criticism to offer. We have only, as teachers, satisfaction to express, both with the scale and the salaries. The first matter I wish to deal with is that of pupil-teachers. My opinion is very similar to that of Mr. Gow, the Inspector. The paragraph at the end of page 1, dealing with pupil-teachers, says that the pupil-teacher must assist the headmaster. I thoroughly agree with that, because I find in the training of pupil-teachers, that it is worse than useless to put them in charge of classes, and once a quarter examine, and then find fault if the work is not well done. They want continual supervision in the course of their work, not criticism at the end of it. You will find pupil-teachers blundering away for a month or so at the commencement, but with a little assistance they will very soon adapt themselves to the work of their classes. I think it is a pity that it is proposed to pay no fees for the instruction of pupil-teachers. This will affect the pupil-teachers on the wrong side—that is to say, they will not get as good training as they would if the headmaster was paid specially for their instruction. Looking at my case, I find that my salary will be very much larger, even taking away the bonus I get for the pupil-teachers. I suppose that to that salary is added the amount I am really expected to get for the increased work; but it seems to me a pity that something is not done, because in large schools the headmaster finds it almost impossible to take all the pupil-teachers himself, and I cannot see that he could very well ask his first assistant to help him when he would get nothing for it. Then, there is the hiatus that exists at the end of the pupil-teacher's course. No matter how carefully we attend to their training, we feel that it is not satisfactory, and that there should be something more done for them at the end of their four years' training. I am not prepared with any scheme, but I think that something more ought to be done for pupil-teachers before they are sent away out to work for themselves without very much help. There is another point, in regard to male pupil-teachers: I find that I have a difficulty in getting boys to come forward for pupil-teachers. I have very great difficulty indeed. The Inspector has said that we get good male pupil-teachers. I have been fortunate, but that is due to accidental circumstances. I have had two vacancies for male pupil-teachers, and in the first case there were two applicants, and one father did not particularly want his boy to come forward; in the second case the only one who applied for the position was selected. I find it is very difficult to induce good boys to apply. I have at the present time ten or twelve girls who would be glad to be pupil-teachers, and I have only one boy. One reason for this is, I think, the difficulty that pupil-teachers find in obtaining employment at their profession after they have passed their apprenticeship. Under the new scale that may be remedied, and boys may have the opportunity of getting places, but I have not worked the matter out. I simply speak of my experience here in Timaru. One table on page 2 has been very interesting to me—that is, the table with the comparison of salaries in the different districts. Two years ago I had to find out what I could about education on the other side—in Australia—and I found there was a general opinion among educationists that in South Australia they were far ahead of any other colony, and probably far ahead of New Zealand — although we would not like to admit it. The reason stated to me was that they had an Inspector-General there, the late Mr. Hartley, who was the cause of the whole thing; but if you look at the table you will find that the salaries probably had a good deal to do with it, and I think that if we raised our salaries here to that standard we would have no cause to complain in New Zealand. With regard to the staffing, I think it is a very liberal one. It seems to give an average of 40 or under 40 to a teacher, and I think that it is better than what we have been working under in South Canterbury—at any rate, in the larger schools. There is one point, however, that I do not agree with. I think that the first two assistants ought to be males, and for this reason: If the second assistant is a female she will usually have to take the Fourth Standard. Now, this standard is really the most difficult in a school to manage, and I have found ladies who do excellent work in the Second and Third Standards find the physical strain too great in the Fourth Standard, and they cannot continue it for more than a year or two. The headmaster would occasionally have to put up the third assistant male to take that standard. The reason why the Fourth and Fifth Standards are more difficult to manage than the Sixth is that in these standards we have boys who are more difficult to manage than in the Sixth. They do not go to the Sixth Standard, but leave school in the Fourth or Fifth, and go to work. The Fourth is usually a very large standard, and I think, for these reasons, that the second, or as well as the first assistant should be a male. In regard to the salaries, we are very well satisfied in South Canterbury. There is one point in regard to the scale upon which I would like to put emphasis. I think it is a good thing to pay high salaries to the headmasters of country schools, because men ought to be induced to look forward to staying in those schools, and not look forward to the country schools as a stepping-stone to the town schools. The third assistant female teacher in a school of 600 to 660 is put down in this scale at £95. Now, I think that is too low, and I will tell you why. We find a great number of our lady teachers do excellent work in the lower standards, and have very little hope of becoming matrons; and, besides, these teachers have not the certificates to become first assistants in large schools. Such a teacher may be serving for thirteen or fourteen years, and can get up to that position, but cannot get beyond it. Therefore £90 is too low, and I would say £110 or £115 should be allotted for that position. If you raised that you would have to raise the next male assistant to £110. There is one point that I would like to refer to before I conclude, and that is School Committees' funds. A burden is put upon some of us to raise funds to support the incidentals of the Committee. That is a point that ought to be settled. I myself, with the help of my assistants, since I came to Timaru, have raised by concerts an average of £47 a year. Of this sum £20 is spent in prizes,

and the rest is required to augment the amount allocated by the Boards towards incidental expenses. This yearly entertainment is a great burden, and tends to upset the school, and might bring the headmaster into friction with some of his assistants. That is a position that ought not to be possible. The headmaster has to ask his assistants to do certain work; it may be done pleasantly, as it has been in my case, but you can easily see that the position is not a right and proper one.

396. *Mr. Davidson.*] You say you have had difficulty in getting suitable boys to enter the service?—Few boys have come forward, but, by accident, mine have turned out to be suitable.

397. In your opinion, is this difficulty of getting males for pupil-teachers experienced in other parts of the colony?—I think we experienced the same in Dunedin, but I was not in a position to know so much about this matter there as here.

398. Have you noted that the proportion of females to males is on the increase throughout the colony?—Yes.

399. What, in your opinion, is the cause of the boys not wishing to enter the service, and the parents not wishing their boys to enter?—Low salaries, and the difficulty of getting places in South Canterbury after they have got through their course. That is the difficulty here.

400. Do you think that, in the interests of education, the proportion of females to males should be largely on the increase?—No.

401. In schools where the Fourth Standard averages 60 or over you would place a male teacher in charge of it?—As a rule.

402. As a rule, then, you would have the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards in the large schools in charge of male teachers?—If the schools are mixed schools.

403. You objected to the salary allotted in scale No. 1 to third female assistant, £95?—I think it is too low.

404. Do you know that under the second or alternative scale the salaries of assistants, both male and female, have been raised to the highest scale in the colony? If so, would that remove your objection on that point?—Yes.

405. *Mr. Stewart.*] You have considerable knowledge of the *personnel* of the teaching profession of the colony?—I have had a little experience.

406. You have been president of the Council of the Educational Institute?—Yes.

407. You have been brought into contact with teachers from all parts of the colony?—Yes.

408. Has your knowledge of the opinions of teachers led you to form an opinion as to whether the profession as a whole is satisfied with the prospects?—I think the profession as a whole is not satisfied.

409. That, on the whole, the profession is dissatisfied with the present state of affairs?—Yes, all over the colony.

410. In your judgment, is the majority of teachers of the colony in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.

411. Of course, you understand the Commission are not in any way bound to any scale laid on the table?—Yes.

412. Do you know if any teachers have left the service because of fluctuating salaries?—Yes; in Otago in particular.

413. Has your scale in South Canterbury been fairly permanent, or been subject to alterations from time to time?—It has been altered twice since I came here, and I think there have been four different scales since 1893.

414. I believe you were in the employ of the Otago Board for some years?—Yes.

415. Did you leave Otago because of the scale in operation at that time in South Canterbury?—After due consideration I thought it was better for me to take the salary and the position offered here. The position was better, while the salary was not much better. But in a very short time my salary dropped from £295 to £258. That is accounted for in this way: the side-school was raised to a principal school, and the attendance went down. I knew nothing about that till I came to Timaru.

416. Was it altogether that, or was it the difference of scale?—No; there was a difference of scale too. I lost £9 by that.

417. What would be the best inducement for males to enter the profession?—Security of tenure, certainty of promotion, and good salaries all round.

418. But can you say that, in reality, what the parents of boys look at on their entering the profession is the possibility of the ultimate salary?—Yes.

419. Are you of opinion that a colonial scale would give greater permanence than a scale drawn up by any Board in the colony?—Yes.

420. You are aware that each year Parliament gives an education vote?—Yes.

421. And there is always a likelihood of fluctuation in the vote?—Yes.

422. You said something about instruction to pupil-teachers: supposing that such a scale as that which we have before us came into operation, do you or do you not think that yourself and your assistants would give the same fidelity to pupil-teachers as you do at present?—I certainly think, looking at my own case, that the pupil-teachers would lose nothing, but I could not answer for my assistants.

423. They would get higher salaries?—Not for teaching pupil-teachers; it would be paid for their position in the school.

424. Are you aware that in Auckland for many years there has been no reward for instructing pupil-teachers?—Yes.

425. And also that one or two of the assistant teachers assist in the work?—I was under the impression that in Auckland the pupil-teachers were centralised, and that the assistants got remuneration for instructing the pupil-teachers in the centres.

426. Has the question of retiring-allowances ever been under the consideration of the Educational Institute?—Yes.

427. Do you know any reason why that matter has not received any practical consideration?—I think the teachers expected to be taxed for this matter, and they were not prepared to submit to any further taxation.

428. Do you think that, if a colonial scale were established, teachers would be willing to make contributions in aid of retiring-allowances?—I really could not answer for the teachers.

429. Would you be willing to?—Yes.

430. Do you think, in the interests of public education, that when teachers arrive at, say, sixty or sixty-five they should be liable to retirement from the service?—One of the best teachers I have known was teaching at the age of seventy, and teaching as vigorously as any young man in the service.

431. Was it an exceptional case?—It is the only one that has come under my notice.

432. Do you think that when a teacher comes to the age of sixty-five years he has not the same freshness of life as when he was younger?—I do not know. I have not reached the age of sixty-five; when I do I will know.

433. Do you think it is in the interests of education that men when they reach the age of sixty-five should continue teaching?—I do not see any reason why it is not, so long as they are fit for their work.

434. Do you think it would be a wise and good hing if the central department were able, after establishing a colonial scale, to submit some scheme for the retirement of teachers when they reach a certain age?—I will support that; but I do not think a teacher should be made to retire at sixty or sixty-five if he is fit for his work.

435. If there was a saving clause, "If in the opinion of the Inspectors or the Boards"?—I think that would be throwing too large a burden on the Inspectors.

436. *Mr. Luke.*] Irrespective altogether of the question of salaries to teachers, do you think that a colonial scale of salaries and staffing would be advantageous to the education of this colony?—I do.

437. Give some reasons?—I think it would give teachers, for one thing, greater permanency; they would not live in an atmosphere of reductions; and probably it would lead to teachers passing more easily from one province to another.

438. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider that the adoption of a colonial scale of salaries would in any way diminish the power or influence of the Education Boards over the teachers?—I cannot see how it would.

439. Do the teachers in South Canterbury favour the centralisation of Inspectors?—We are very satisfied here.

440. You would oppose the centralisation of Inspectors?—As a matter of personal feeling I would.

441. Do the Inspectors oppose a colonial scale of salaries for teachers?—I really have not asked them.

442. Do you think they would work detrimentally to the interests of the teachers?—Not at all.

443. Do you find that there is too great readiness on the part of the South Canterbury Board to establish small schools?—I have not really gone into that question at all. The only school I objected to was the South School being so close to my own.

444. The teachers as a whole have made no protest against the establishment of small schools?—Not so far as I am aware.

445. Would the Board take any notice of them if they did protest?—Yes; the Board have always received any communication from the teachers in a proper spirit. We feel we can always approach the Board here in South Canterbury.

446. What is the average attendance at your school?—Last week it was 645; the roll-number is 702.

447. How many have you got in the Seventh Standard?—I have had 40 up to last week; now I have 36.

448. Do you take charge of that standard yourself?—No; at present I have it in charge of a pupil-teacher. I am fortunate enough to have a pupil-teacher who can do it.

449. How much does that pupil-teacher get?—About £30 a year; he is not doing any more work than he would be doing in any other part of the school.

450. Does the work consist chiefly of supervision?—No; I help him as much as I can, and I satisfy myself that the work is being done satisfactorily.

451. Where do you propose to put the extra assistant that you would be provided with under the new scale?—I would probably put an assistant to help the matron in the infant-room. I think there should be a matron and assistant in the infant-room.

452. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you not think that in a large school like yours the pupil-teachers should be taught by the certificated members of the staff as part of their duties?—Under the new scale I would not ask my staff to do the work.

453. If it was required in the large schools that all certificated teachers should participate in the instruction of pupil-teachers out of school-hours, do you think that would be a good rule?—I think that if that were done it would certainly lead to greater efficiency, because at present the work is too much for the headmaster.

454. Take your school as an example: have you any system of training pupil-teachers by means of criticism lessons or model lessons?—Yes.

455. Have you a regulation after this manner: "In all schools where pupil-teachers are employed quarterly criticism lessons shall be given by each member of the staff in rotation"?—No.

456. Do you think it a valuable means of training your pupil-teachers?—I think something more ought to be done.

457. Do you not think that where you have so many applicants to become pupil-teachers some means should be adopted in anticipation of their becoming teachers?—Yes.

458. Do you think that a pupil-teacher in charge of Standard VII. is satisfactory?—I think it is altogether objectionable to put a pupil-teacher in charge of Standard VII.

459. In connection with the proposed staffing, it states in a note that a fifth-year pupil-teacher continuing in the same school shall receive the remuneration of a third-year pupil-teacher, but if transferred to another school shall be paid as a fourth-year pupil-teacher: do you think it a proper thing to penalise pupil-teachers like that, after going through their course of instruction?—No; I think it would discourage them.

460. Do you think it right to even suggest it?—I would object to it; I would keep them on at the last year's salary.

461. You have teachers holding the same classification: do they hold similar appointments?—No, it is impossible.

462. Do you expect that teachers who have similar classifications should have similar salaries?—No.

463. Do teachers with the same classification expect to have the same salary irrespective of the position they are in?—No.

464. Could you suggest some plan for promoting those teachers with high classifications who are low down?—I think that would need weeks of consideration.

465. You see difficulties?—Yes.

466. Do you think that a general scheme of promotion should be adopted equally with the scale?—I do not know how a general scheme of promotion would work, or whether it would be possible to promote in the same way as they do in Victoria. We find very good teachers with low certificates.

467. Which do you think of greater importance—literary knowledge or technical skill?—I would take a man with an E certificate who could teach against a university man who could not teach.

468. Do you think that your school is about as large as a school should be for effective working?—I really cannot say from experience. I find 700 quite enough for me when I come to the quarterly examination.

469. Which do you think would be the fairer basis of payment—the average attendance, or payment on the number present during the week?—I think it would be fairer to pay on the number actually present.

470. *The Chairman.*] I think you said that the principal factors in securing the best class of teachers would be security of tenure and certainty of promotion: do you know of any profession in life where these things are obtainable?—No.

471. The matter of getting up concerts to assist the Committee is purely voluntary on the part of the teachers?—Certainly.

472. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do the children bring money to contribute towards the cost of firewood or stationery in South Canterbury?—"Pen-and-ink" money is collected in my school.

TUESDAY, 28TH MAY, 1901.

J. A. VALENTINE, B.A., Timaru South School, examined.

Mr. Valentine: I appear as secretary of the local branch of the Educational Institute, and in making my statement I have had to weave together a good many opinions sent in to me by teachers in the district. First, concerning a colonial scale: I am in favour of one decidedly, on the grounds of—(1) justice all round; (2) equality of payment for similar work; (3) greater steadiness and less fluctuation of salaries; (4) more likelihood of a living-wage after years of service, and with little hope of promotion; and (5) a national system of education should have a national scale of payment. I should say I favoured a colonial scale before I came to South Canterbury. I am an Otago teacher, and for some time before I left there the idea of a colonial scale had formed itself in my mind. Concerning the second scale, I corroborate the figures submitted by Mr. Bell yesterday, although I think he has overstated somewhat the amount which our teachers would gain, because he has omitted to take into account lodging-allowance and the non-payment for pupil-teachers, the latter amounting in some cases to as much as £35. Salaries in our larger schools would be made something like those now paid in similar schools in the larger districts. I think the amended scale is commendable, but I think that males and females should be paid the same salaries up to a certain point; what that point is I am not prepared to indicate—perhaps up to £100 or £120. They do much the same work in the schools as assistants. When it comes to the stage at which a man is expected to marry, differentiation should take place, but not before. I think the salaries of assistants should be high enough to enable them to marry, because they have no great chance of promotion, as many of our head-teachers are men still in the prime of life. Then, again, the teachers' salaries should compare favourably with the pay given in other walks of life. Remember that our work deals with mind, not with matter, and that through our hands must pass the great majority of the future rulers of the colony. Besides, it is trying work, and the pay for it should be at least equal to that obtained in other professions requiring similar expenditure of mental energy and bodily vigour. Many engineers and other artisans are better paid than teachers. If the salaries are high, I think it will induce the best men to come into the profession, and it means that better work will be done for the country. Poor teachers mean wasted years for many children. Concerning staffing, I think that the general principle of the

scale is good, seeing that at most teachers will not have on an average more than 40 pupils each; but many of our South Canterbury teachers would not like to see the provision of the first proposed scale retained, giving a mistress at 36, on the grounds that their pupils would get much sounder instruction than they can get now; and, further, that in scattered country districts to maintain an average of 41 means a roll-number of over 50, so that in fine weather one teacher may often have 45 or 48 to teach and be responsible for. That is far too many for one teacher to do justice to. Concerning the scale, I object to the regulation requiring that in schools of an average of from 19 to 35 there shall be a deduction of £10 from the salary of the master for a sewing-mistress. Suppose such a case as this—and we have such here: A man is in a school where the average has fallen to 20; his salary is at the highest £120, but the certificate for this class of school is E2, and that requires at least eight years to get. In all probability the man would be penalised by at least 4 per cent.; hence his salary would be £120, *minus* £10 for sewing-mistress, *minus* nearly £5 penalty for low certificate, or £105, which is too little for the work done. Then, again, why should even a teacher's wife work for nothing? Sewing has always been paid for by the Boards, and why should teachers in any school have to pay for it now? With regard to the certificate, I have to say, would not D4 be better for such schools? Concerning the deductions of 1 per cent. and 4 per cent., I think, whilst all teachers should be encouraged to reach the highest literary attainments, that these deductions operate very unjustly on the small districts remote from university centres. Yet even here we have men who attain their degrees without ever entering a university: more praise to them. Again, these deductions might result in injustice in another way, for Inspectors differ so in their awarding of marks to teachers—for instance, a D3 here might equal a D2 in another district, for in South Canterbury teachers are promoted much more slowly than in most other districts. I am prepared to say that it is so, and here I quote figures in support of my statement. On an average during the last four years 32 per cent. of the teachers that might be promoted by marks have been advanced every year in Wellington; in Grey and Wanganui, 31 per cent.; in Westland, 28 per cent.; in Hawke's Bay, 27 per cent.; in Auckland, 25 per cent.; in Southland, 23 per cent.; in Marlborough, 19 per cent.; in Nelson, 18 per cent.; in South Canterbury, 16 per cent.; in North Canterbury and Taranaki, 15 per cent.; in Otago, 12 per cent. For years past the Inspectors here and in Otago have not granted a "1" to assistant teachers, hence you see Inspectors differ so much in their awarding of marks that "3" or "2" in one district may be equal to the higher figure in another. If deductions are to be made they should not apply to the present holders of positions. It has been suggested to me by teachers in this district that as an incentive to further study a small bonus should be paid to all who raise themselves to a letter above that required by any colonial scale for any given position. This leads to the question of the certificates required. I think that it is wise for certain grades of schools that certain certificates should be required. Virtually, in every district in the colony such a requirement, either written or unwritten, exists, and I think it better that it should be in black and white, and the same all over the colony. But the present holders should not be penalised. I think many of our D1 teachers are fit for any position up to at least 600, and many of them should have been awarded C, which is now withheld by the drastic requirements of the department. I think that E certificates might in future be done away with, although many of our best matrons are classified only E. But twenty years ago the facilities for passing in such subjects as science were much fewer than now, hence that subject alone prevented many of our infant mistresses from securing a D. Then, too, in schools beginning at 19 and going up to 120, I should say that better steps for headmasters would be D4, D3, D2, and D1 for schools from 150 to 600. For assistants I should say E1 and E2 should be at least equal to D3, and that a D2 certificate should be required of first assistants in schools of from 250 to 600. Regarding the average attendance, I might say that the present system of calculating averages operates very harshly. Epidemics and bad weather seriously lower averages in country schools, and in such as my own school. If we have a wet day in the middle of the week the attendance for the remainder of the week is affected. Even throwing out those days on which the attendance is half the number on the roll, it operates very harshly. If teachers know that Thursday is to be a holiday they know the attendance on Friday will be weak, and that expedients must be adopted to prevent the attendance falling below the half. I think averages should be calculated from the attendance on days when not fewer than two-thirds of the roll-number were present.

473. *Mr. Luke.*] How do you propose to do away with the E certificate? Would you alter the qualifications?—I said that in future it should be done away with. I think the E certificate is of comparatively little value. So far as actual teaching goes, it is of value, but the literary attainment is not high enough; and in these days there should be no trouble for any one desiring to make teaching his profession in obtaining a D.

474. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you had large experience as a teacher in Otago?—I taught in Otago for ten years.

475. Is it not a fact that a teacher is expected to do a good deal more work in Otago than in South Canterbury?—I do not think so; my work here is quite as heavy as ever it was in Otago.

476. Is it not a fact that the staffing here is more liberal than that allowed by the Otago Board?—It is in the smaller schools.

477. What is the average at your school?—Last quarter it was 209.

478. How many assistants are there at the school?—An infant mistress, first female assistant, and one pupil-teacher.

479. With regard to the proposals in the scheme, it is suggested to bring in a mistress when the attendance comes to 36: do you not consider that a sole teacher can efficiently teach a school of 40 to 45 without assistance?—I think a capable teacher can manage 40 children.

480. Not more than 40?—A good deal depends on the class of children; in some districts the children are not so intellectually bright as in others.

481. Does not a good deal also depend on the class of teacher?—Undoubtedly.

482. The more a teacher has to do the higher salaries the Board can afford to pay?—That is so.

483. And consequently the higher salaries they pay the better the teachers they are likely to attract?—In general that is true.

484. Do you find that the teachers in South Canterbury would prefer to do a good day's work and get a good day's pay rather than have the schools overstaffed and salaries reduced?—That aspect of the question I have never heard discussed; but I have heard them say they would prefer to have a mistress at 36, especialty in the scattered country districts.

485. That would be the class of schools on which the Board lose most?—Yes.

486. You have stated that there is diversity of practice in the assignment of marks on teachers' efficiency: would those anomalies not be got over if the Inspectors were placed under the central department?—I cannot say they would, unless explicit instructions were issued to the Inspectors.

487. Do you think a bonus would place teachers in the various educational districts on the same footing?—Personally, I do not uphold the bonus system; I simply mentioned it because I was asked to do so by teachers.

488. With regard to the average, do you consider that it would be preferable that the average for the whole year should be taken as the basis on which the average attendance should be calculated rather than for the preceding quarter only?—If for the year, it would have to be for the four previous quarters, and not for any fixed period known as a year.

489. What provision would you suggest should be made for the purging of the rolls so as to make sure that the teacher was not allowing names to remain on the roll that should not be there?—A provision already exists in the instructions from the Head Office that all names of children not attending for the previous sixty-five days are not to remain on the roll.

490. Does your Institute favour a superannuation scheme?—It has never been discussed, but I am sure that the feeling in South Canterbury would be in favour of such a scheme.

491. *Mr. Hill.*] Why do you limit the equal salaries to male and female teachers to £120 at the outside?—I think that at that stage you are approaching the time when a male teacher gets married.

492. Do you think schools below 30 should be taught by a woman?—I think a woman can do good work there, as far as my experience goes.

493. Supposing a limit was made that all schools below 30 should be taught by women, and that all schools between 30 and 40 should be taught by men, do you think that would be approved by the Institute?—I have not heard the point discussed, and cannot give an opinion.

494. Supposing you made 45 the limit for a master to take help, it would be possible to provide a much better salary for that class of school: do you think that would be approved?—Two teachers told me they would prefer to have an assistant teacher brought in at 35 to having a higher salary.

495. Do you think it should be a pupil-teacher or an assistant teacher?—I think a pupil-teacher should never be appointed to such a school.

496. Do you approve of the principle of classification by certificates?—In a general way, yes.

497. You think that teachers who are supposed to hold these various appointments should hold certificates such as are named in the scale?—I think that, as such requirements exist in every district in the colony, it is better it should be in black and white, and the same all over the colony.

498. Why should a teacher who possesses a Government certificate be debarred from applying for any position in the teaching service?—I do not consider A5 a good certificate.

499. Would you suggest that only one certificate should be issued by the department?—I would suggest a simplification of the present certificate, but I am not in a position to say in what form it should be.

500. Would one certificate meet your views?—No, I do not think it would.

501. You think E should be done away with?—The literary part of it, at all events.

502. Do you think B and A should be done away with?—No, because it is the duty of the Government to induce teachers to obtain the highest literary attainments possible.

503. You think that some modification should be made in the method of calculating the average attendance: do you think the actual number present during the week should be made the basis?—If the colony could stand it, I should be in favour, from my own point of view, of adopting that suggestion.

504. *Mr. Smith.*] If the number of attendances were to be counted, or the working-average were raised, would there be any greater temptation to neglect the proper purging of the roll than now?—I have not considered it, but I should not say there would be.

505. *Mr. Hogben.*] Supposing you had 240 on the roll, and 20 of them ought not to be there, and if there were 115 present you would accept 115, would you not, on a half basis?—Yes.

506. But if you deduct the 20 who ought not to be on the roll 115 would not be less than half the roll-number, so that if you purged your roll properly you would not be entitled to the benefit of the regulation?—That is so.

507. According to the return the great majority of certificates are Es?—That may be; but I hold that the literary attainments of E are not high enough for the requirements of the colony.

508. Do you mean the great majority of teachers do not possess literary attainments sufficient for the requirements of the colony?—My remarks all apply to the future. I do not say that the present holders should be at all penalised.

509. Have you studied the E and D pass-list for the year?—Yes.

510. Do you notice the number of D candidates that fail compared with the number of E candidates?—D candidates in many instances go up unprepared.

511. Do you think that that necessarily means that in every case they will not make good teachers because they could not pass D?—No.

512. Why deny them the minimum certificate?—I should not like to debar any one from the profession.

513. Does not raising the minimum qualification mean that?—It may; but I stick to my ground that the present qualification for E is not high enough.

514. You would raise it to D?—No, I do not say that.

515. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you ever examined the examination-papers set for E or for D in New Zealand with the papers set for the certificate of competency in Victoria, or similar examinations in the other Australian Colonies?—No.

516. Then, you cannot say from personal experience, or from comparison, how the difficulties of obtaining an E certificate compare with the difficulties of getting similar certificates in the Australian Colonies?—No.

517. *The Chairman.*] I think you said there was house allowance made in this district to a great many teachers?—To a number of them.

518. Do you know whether the allowance is made to a large number?—I could not say offhand how many.

519. I understood from the remarks you made that you are in favour of a differential salary for married and unmarried teachers?—No, not exactly that, but for male and female teachers after a certain point.

520. Was not the point in your argument that the salary of a male should be increased to enable him to get married?—After a certain point I think he should be able to look forward to that.

521. Would you make the allowance conditional on his getting married?—No, certainly not.

522. You made a comparison of teachers and other workers: do you think the work of an engine-driver is unskilled labour?—No.

523. Can he do it without apprenticeship?—No.

524. Could a teacher do the work of an engine-driver?—No.

525. Is there any comparison between the work of driving an engine on a railway and driving the intellectual machine?—I think not; the engine will go if you pull a lever, but the mind will not.

526. Is the responsibility less in one case than the other?—Yes.

527. In which case is the responsibility greater?—In the case of the teacher.

528. Where is the teacher's responsibility? Does it involve life and limb?—No; it is a nation's destiny—the mind.

529. Is there life in danger through incompetent teaching?—Yes; revolution and anarchy.

530. Do you think engine-drivers have pleasanter times than teachers? Do they have as many holidays?—I do not know.

531. Do engine-drivers enjoy better hours of labour?—I cannot say. I do not know what their hours are; but a teacher's hours are interminable.

532. Is an engine-driver less exposed to weather and climatic influences?—He is more exposed.

533. Are his health, life, and limbs better protected than are the teacher's?—No, I do not think so.

534. Which species of employment do you think the better?—If I had my life to live over again I would take that of the engine-driver.

535. What experience have you had since you took up teaching that gives you your knowledge of engine-driving?—I have relatives in the profession.

536. Do you think the allowances made to School Committees are sufficient to keep the schools in order?—With my own Committee the allowance is not, for they are bankrupt now, and want me to help to get up a concert to augment their funds.

537. Do you think that if they are allowed more money the school will be kept in better order for the children?—I think so.

538. The school must be suffering for lack of funds?—Everything has gone on all right so far; but I do not know how long it will continue to do so.

J. P. Kalaugher, Seadown School, examined.

Mr. Kalaugher: I represent the country teachers. At the outset I may say that we look upon the colonial scale of staffs and salaries with the greatest favour. It means a substantial rise all round to us. The South Canterbury Board is one of the few Boards which have kept on the right side of their incomes. Time and again they have altered the scale, and every alteration has meant a reduction to us. I have been nine years a headmaster of country schools in South Canterbury, and at the present time I am getting less than I was nine years ago, although in that period I am supposed to have had two rises in position. It may be a rise in position, but the salary is less, and at the present time I am getting £42 10s. a year less than I was getting three years ago. That is how the South Canterbury teachers have been treated by this Board. Therefore I think it is a very desirable thing that a colonial scale should be brought forward at the earliest opportunity. I see that in the table presented to the Commission by the Otago Institute the average teacher's salary in South Canterbury is put down at £152. I am in the eleventh largest school in South Canterbury, and at the present time I am receiving the princely salary of £147 per annum, and I must be getting more than the average salary, for there are sixty-eight schools. I agree with the first proposed scale as to the necessity for assistance when the average has reached 36. Schools of from

36 to 40 are very hard schools to work. I consider that when the average has reached 35 a pupil-teacher should be appointed. I think that 90 is too high a stage at which to introduce the pupil-teacher. Schools with an average of from 75 to 90 cannot be taught successfully by two teachers without an undue amount of work. I have had a good deal of experience in schools of that size, and know what I speak about when I say that to get an average of 90 you require to have a roll-number of 110 or more. In the Third Standard and upwards there will be 63 children in a school with an average attendance of 90, and that is too much for one teacher. A great deal of injustice is done to country teachers by payment being made on average attendance. In all country districts the children are kept at home a great deal to help their parents at work—dairying, potato-growing, and harvesting are the chief causes of bad attendances; whilst in the towns the children have no such reasons for staying at home. Then, in the country the compulsory clauses of the School Attendance Act are a farce. In many schools the children who attend badly are members of families of School Committeemen, and it is expecting too much to ask that any member of the Committee should seek to put the compulsory clauses of the Act in operation against a brother member. Then, again, there is the question of distance; and in most country schools the enforcement of the clauses is barred by the distance the children have to come to school. I think the best plan would be, instead of making payment on the average attendance, to make it on the number of children who have attended half-time. We have to teach those children, and ought to be paid for them. Some allowance would, of course, have to be made for those entering or leaving during the quarter. It would be a great advantage to country schools. In my school the attendance last quarter was only 68, which is particularly bad, yet 72 children attended at least half-time. In the previous quarter the average was 76, whilst 83 attended half-time. One of the chief defects in the scale is that the children attending country schools have no chance of becoming pupil-teachers. In South Canterbury there are only eight schools with an average attendance of over 90, and in those eight schools they have an average attendance of 2,400 in round numbers. There are sixty country schools, with an average attendance of 2,100, in which no child can possibly become a pupil-teacher. I say that is one of the chief defects of the system, as it debars the teaching profession to children in the country. In the appointment of pupil-teachers some scheme should be devised by which vacancies should be open to the competition of children throughout the district. I am in favour of no deductions being made from the salaries of headmasters in small schools where a sewing-mistress is appointed, and I am in favour of payment for instruction of pupil-teachers. The Otago scale seeks to make the country schools a stepping-stone to the town schools; but here in this district when we go into the country we have to stay there, for there is no hope of promotion. It has been the practice with this Board, when any good position became vacant, to fill it from outside. Almost every good position in the service has been filled up from outside. We are here between North Canterbury and Otago, and our applications are barred. We are not told that, but we know it. There is no hope for promotion in our own district, and when we go to a country school we know we have to stay there. Too many small schools are built, and time and again the Board have built schools where there was no necessity for them at all. The practice of conveying children to centres should be extended.

539. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your experience as a teacher?—I have been seventeen years a teacher: four years a pupil-teacher in a school of about 250; then assistant in the Temuka District High School; first assistant at Greytown North, in the Wellington District; assistant in Timaru Main School; and headmaster of three different schools in the country.

540. What is your present position?—Headmaster of the Seadown School.

541. What is the average attendance?—68 last quarter.

542. What is your staff?—Myself and a mistress.

543. You stated that you approved of the introduction of a second certificated teacher when the attendance reaches 40?—Yes.

544. Do you think a male teacher could not manage efficiently a greater number than an average of 40?—Yes, I suppose so, if paid for it.

545. How many do you think a female teacher could manage efficiently by herself?—No over 30.

546. Surely, if that woman was relieved of Standards III., IV., V., and VI. completely, she could manage to teach an average of 45 in the lower standards?—I have no doubt she would find plenty to do.

547. What would the master have to do in a school where the average was 75?—He would not have to stand round and look pleasant.

548. Suppose the master had an average of 37 from Standard III. upwards; you say a master can teach all the classes with an average of 40: surely when he gets rid of the infants and Standards I. and II. he can teach more than an average of 40?—I have tried it, and know what work there is; with an average of 90 there is too much to do for two teachers.

549. Do you know that in Otago only quite recently the average attendance required before a pupil-teacher was allowed was 110?—Yes, I am aware of that.

550. Have you heard that the teaching in Otago was less efficient than in other parts of the colony?—No.

551. Have you heard that the South Australian system is considered the best in Australia?—No, I have not heard that.

552. Have you compared the staffing allowed in Mr. Hogben's No. 2 scale with that in the other districts of New Zealand and Australia?—I have a fair idea of the staffs in New Zealand.

553. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Are you in favour of a superannuation scheme?—Yes.

554. *Mr. Luke.*] What certificate do you hold?—D1.

555. *Mr. Hill.*] I understand you approve of the scale generally?—Yes.

556. Would you approve if a colonial scheme of promotions were adopted also?—No; but I believe that other districts should be open to us, as this district is open to others.

557. But I understood you to say that you had been teaching in Wellington?—Yes; but I came back here again.

558. You say that the recommendation as to having an infant mistress up to 90 would work somewhat harshly?—Yes.

559. What would you say to a classification giving a master, mistress, and pupil-teacher at 80?—I would approve of that.

560. *Mr. Hogben.*] You said that one objection to the suggested second scheme was that the children in country schools would be debarred from becoming pupil-teachers: did you notice that the scheme suggested provision for allowances for pupil-teachers living away from home?—Yes.

561. Do you not think that that would meet the difficulty?—No, for the reason that pupil-teachers will in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred be selected from the school in which the vacancy occurs.

562. You understand that power with the pupil-teachers is in the hands of the Board?—Yes.

563. Do you think there should be a fewer number of subjects for a sole teacher than in a school where there are two teachers?—Yes.

564. And that would to some extent modify your answer as to the number of pupils a sole teacher can take?—Yes.

565. *The Chairman.*] You think the country children ought to have as efficient a system of education as they have in the towns?—Certainly.

566. You say that the good positions here are generally filled up by outsiders?—Yes.

567. Do many of these good positions become vacant?—No.

568. I presume the changes in those good positions are very infrequent?—There are very few good positions in this district.

569. Do you think the pay of teachers in schools, say, of under 90 is adequate?—No; the ordinary artisan makes more than I do; but in my case understand that I am in one of the worst-paid schools in New Zealand.

570. Then, you are aware that there is about 50 per cent. difference between the salary at a school like yours in this district than one in Hawke's Bay?—Fully that, if not more.

571. With regard to the Committee, do you think it receives sufficient incidental expenses to keep the school in thoroughly good order?—Country School Committees get enough to keep the schools in a state of cleanliness and provide fuel and keep the grounds in order, but they can do no repairs.

572. You think there should be a little more allowed to Committees?—Yes, I think so.

M. McLeod, B.A., Head-teacher, Temuka District High School, examined.

Mr. McLeod: I think that the reckoning of the salary on the average attendance as at present is most unfair. The average attendance in South Canterbury schools is about 86 per cent. of the roll-number. In the large schools it is about 90 per cent. of the roll-number—that is, 90 children out of 100 are there nearly every day, and have to be taught. It is only exceptional circumstances that will bring down the attendance of schools like mine to 80 per cent. of the roll-number, and it is not fair that a day like that should be counted. A number of witnesses have suggested that only those days on which there are at least 66 per cent. present should be counted. I think the minimum ought to be made 75 per cent.; any cause that brings the attendance down below 75 per cent. is exceptional, and an exceptional cause should not be a factor in determining the staff and salary of a school. In my own school we can just keep up an average of from 326 to 330 if the weather is fine. For two quarters last year the attendance went down below 321 through wet weather. Through that we had to lose one teacher, or keep her on for a quarter at half-pay, while all the others lost in salary. I do not think that Mr. Hill's scheme would work very well. It would be a better system to take the average attendance, throwing out all those days on which the attendance is below 75 per cent. There is just one other point that I should like to refer to, and that is the inducement for teachers to remain in the service. I say that people go into the teaching profession just for the same reason that they go in for anything else, and that is the amount of salary and the chances of promotion. In South Canterbury there are five schools with over £200 of salary, and about two others just on the verge of it. In a district with sixty-eight schools I could not hold out any hope for the average young fellow going in for the teaching profession in South Canterbury of getting one of those five or seven schools. The average teacher must look forward to a country school, and country teachers ought to be adequately remunerated. Country-school teachers ought to get salaries at least equal to those earned by men who occupy positions of equal difficulty and responsibility in other occupations. I know two brothers about the same age as myself who went into a country store, and who for the last five years have been laying by £1,000 a year. I would like to see the school-teacher who could do that. I could name over eight in this district who within the last few years have left the service, and two others who intended to do so, because they thought that the teachers were not sufficiently well paid, and that their chances of promotion were too few. The two referred to were just on the point of leaving when they managed to get a promotion.

573. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you in favour of a colonial scheme of staffs and salaries?—I am.

574. Do you think, under a colonial scale of salaries and staffing, that changes would be less frequent than they have been in South Canterbury?—Yes, I think so.

575. Have you had any experience in small schools?—Yes.

576. Do you agree with the proposal to introduce an assistant mistress when the average attendance reaches 40?—Yes; I think that is as fair a number as one could choose.

577. Do you think it advisable to postpone the appointment of a pupil-teacher till 90 is reached?—I should say that is a fair number.

578. Do you think the suggestion of raising the percentage to two-thirds instead of one-half would meet the difficulty?—I think it should be at least 75 per cent., for the reasons I have stated.

579. Do you object to the deduction from the headmaster's salary for the payment of a sewing-mistress in the small schools?—A number of country teachers have asked me to object if I were asked that question.

580. Do you know the South Canterbury District fairly well?—Yes.

581. Are there more small schools than are fairly necessary?—Yes; but I may say that these small schools have arisen in a way which should partly excuse the Board from blame. A village springs up, and a school is applied for and granted. Another village might spring up three miles away, and an application be put in for a school, which would also be granted. Now, if a school occupied a position between the two you would have one good school instead of two small ones; or there might be the conveyance of children from one village to another. I think there are a number of instances in South Canterbury where the schools are too close together.

582. Do you think that the teaching of children in the country would be more efficient if there were fewer small schools and more central schools, each amalgamating two or three small schools?—Yes.

583. You think it would be to the interests of education that there should be as few small schools as possible?—Yes.

584. What is your present position?—Headmaster of the Temuka District High School.

585. How would the bringing-in of this scale affect you?—As far as I can see, I would be reduced.

586. What is the average attendance?—326.

587. What would be the salary under the proposed scale?—£273, *plus* capitation, or £280.

588. To what extent would you suffer if you got only the salary allowed for a primary school of the size of your school?—About £50.

589. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you not consider, if a uniform scale of salaries were introduced into the colony, and this unrest and dissatisfaction got rid of, it would be a good thing for the education system of the colony?—Yes, it would.

590. Do you think it advisable to centralise the Inspectors under the Education Department?—I have no strong feelings in the matter; personally, I would prefer the Inspectors to remain as they are.

591. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] The Inspectors are the best judges, are they not, of what would benefit themselves?—I should say so.

592. They passed a resolution at the conference in favour of centralisation?—Yes, but not merely to better themselves; their primary motive was no doubt to benefit the cause of education in the colony.

593. I suppose the Board would experience considerable difficulty if they attempted to close any of these small schools?—Yes; there would be deputations from the householders.

594. With regard to giving facilities to teachers to get certificates and improve their status, would you approve of the establishment of more collegiate classes and training-schools?—Yes.

595. Would you be in favour of uniform pupil-teachers' examinations throughout the whole colony?—Yes.

596. Then, would you favour the examination of teachers by the Education Department rather than by the University for Classes C, B, and A?—I think that the University sets an examination for those on about the same lines now, and I do not see any necessity for duplicating the examination.

597. Then, would you favour as well the abandoning of Class D or the Matriculation Examination, or recognising the Matriculation Examination by the Education Department, seeing that the University does not recognise Class D by the Education Department?—Yes; I think it is a matter of convenience for the Education Department and for the teachers to have the Matriculation Examination recognised as at present.

598. With regard to female teachers, are you in favour of giving equal pay to males and emales in schools where the females discharge duties just as efficiently as the males?—In that case I think they should be paid equally.

599. *Mr. Hill.*] How many rooms are there in connection with your school?—Seven.

600. What is paid to the caretaker?—£30 a year.

601. Is he required to clean the rooms daily?—He is required to sweep and dust daily, and set the fires, and all that sort of work. Besides that, he is supposed to trim the fences, and keep the place generally in order.

602. Do your Committee find the money placed at their disposal sufficient?—No, not quite; they raise money by contributions from the children by means of a Stationery and Fuel Fund.

603. That is voluntary?—Yes.

604. Supposing any children refused to pay—is there any mumuring?—Teachers urge them to pay.

605. What amount do you expect them to pay?—6d. a quarter in the Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards; in the others, 3d. a quarter.

606. Are many objections raised?—A good many object, and do not pay.

607. *Mr. Hogben.*] Regarding the number of different scales that obtained in South Canterbury, you do not mean to imply, any more than previous witnesses, that it is the fault of the Board that

the salaries had to be reduced?—I say it was forced on the Board. It was inevitable from the smallness of the funds available; they had no other way out of the difficulty.

608. *The Chairman.*] What is the chief cause of irregular attendances—bad weather, or epidemics?—The weather.

609. Is there any class of school suffering more than another from irregular attendances?—The attendance at country schools is more frequently below 50 per cent. than it is in the towns.

610. Do you think that country schools are affected to a much greater extent by bad roads and weather than are town schools?—I say they would be more affected if we reckoned on the strict average; but when all attendances under 50 per cent. are thrown out I cannot say which is the more affected.

611. *Mr. Hill.*] Supposing there were 100 on the roll, and the average attendance was 85—we will assume that 85 per cent. constituted the average regular attendance—it is evident that there must be between 85 and 100 present. Supposing that there were 100 present one week and 90 another, would not that benefit the teachers a great deal, and would not it represent the actual number taught by the teachers in the school?—Yes, it would.

612. You have done the work, and these children have actually been taught during the period: is not that a fairer plan than mere payment on average attendance—is not that a fairer basis for estimating results?—It is a much fairer basis, provided some allowance is made in the case of epidemics.

AUCKLAND.

SATURDAY, 1ST JUNE, 1901.

T. U. WELLS, President of the Auckland Branch of the New Zealand Institute, examined.

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your position?—I am headmaster of the Richmond Road School, Ponsonby. I have the honour to represent the Auckland and District Institute before you, and I am here on behalf of that Institute to urge the Institution of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries. I think I am correct in stating that it is the unanimous wish of the Auckland teachers that there should be a colonial scale of staffs and salaries. We are prepared to give a list, almost as long as the Commission wishes, of the anomalies which at present exist in the different educational districts in the matter of the payment of salaries and the arrangement of staffs. Probably the Commission is already well acquainted with those anomalies, and will not desire further evidence on that point—evidence culled from the official lists. I might point out at the outset that teachers fully recognise the difficulty under which Boards have laboured in the institution of small schools in scattered districts, and there is no doubt that that difficulty has largely led to the anomalies which exist; but we wish to impress upon you the state of unrest and dissatisfaction into which the profession is thrown through the constant changing and threatened changing of salaries. I have been teaching under the Auckland Board for fifteen or sixteen years, and during the whole of that time I do not remember any period in which there was not some change in salaries either under discussion or proposed. For the last fifteen or sixteen years we have had changes in salaries and alterations in the staffing threatened, and sometimes actually carried out. I need not point out that that has induced the greatest unrest and dissatisfaction in the teaching profession. The anomalies which prevail increase that dissatisfaction, which must be regarded as only natural when a man knows that a man in an adjoining province, doing almost exactly the same work, is receiving 20 or 30 per cent. more than he is receiving. This Institute wishes to urge that in a public service where men are doing the same work in different districts the rate of remuneration should be practically the same. We wish to urge that equal pay should be offered for equal work done. I might point out that in the different Australian Colonies uniform salaries exist, and that in other public departments in New Zealand uniform systems of salaries are adopted. The servants of the Railway Department are classified and paid uniformly, and the servants of the Postal Department are also paid uniformly. It is only in our service where different rates of pay prevail. This is due, doubtless, to the fact that there are thirteen different Education Boards, each having its own scale. Those are briefly the reasons why our Institute earnestly urges the adoption of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries. Coming to the question of the proposed scale and the supplementary scale since issued, I have been asked by a number of teachers from smaller country schools to point out that a hardship will be done if they do not receive assistance before the school reaches an attendance of 40. I have been asked to make the suggestion to the Commission that, if possible, a third-year pupil-teacher should be appointed when the school reaches an average of 35, and be continued there until an average of, say, 50 is reached. Country teachers are of opinion that they are asked to do too much in being asked to teach a school until an average of 40 is reached. In making that suggestion I do so on behalf of the teachers of small country schools. I am asked to give the Institute's unqualified approval of the proposal to give capitation allowance per head as proposed in the scheme which has been issued. I think the system adopted previously of paying capitation on increases of 10, and so on, is not so fair as the one now proposed, and teachers state that capitation per head over a certain number is equitable and fair. Then, with regard to the salaries paid in country schools, I wish to urge on behalf of the Institute that these must be made as liberal as possible, so that a teacher in a country district may have a reasonable opportunity of bringing up his family and providing for old age, and that he may not have to seek constant change. We urge that teachers of country schools are entitled to a fairly settled condition, and to have their salaries made as liberal as possible, so that the country teacher may not be so anxious for change and removal as at present. A strong point in favour of a liberal allowance to the country schools is that at present the education given in the country is all that the children of the country settlers can look forward to, and it is

important for the colony that that education should be of the best possible character. With regard to our larger schools, I am asked to urge that as high a maximum as possible should be fixed. The Auckland Institute feels strongly that it is on the maximum—on the prizes that are offered—that the character of the teaching profession will depend. Our bright boys look not to the average rate of remuneration, but to the prizes. A clever boy, feeling what is within him, will not enter a profession unless he has some reasonable hopes of obtaining in the future an adequate reward. Our prizes have been too few in the past, and the result is that our best boys look askance at the teaching profession. In my own experience, and I believe in the majority of my fellow-teachers, bright boys will not enter the profession, and in many cases where a boy himself has an inclination for teaching, his parents object to his entering a profession which offers so few prizes as ours. The opinion of the Institute, as far as I have been able to estimate it, is that lady teachers should not receive pay equal to that of the men, but, on the other hand, that there should not be much difference. They urge that the salaries should not be the same in consequence of the greater responsibilities which for the most part fall to the man's care. At the same time, we would feel sorry to see a great difference made in rates of pay for equal work. There has been some discussion among us in regard to the proposal in the scheme of Mr. Hogben's for the staffing of schools. As far as I can gather, many of our teachers prefer that there should be a parallel scheme for males and females—first male, second male, third male, and so on, and first female, second female, and third female—rather than that they should be sandwiched as in Mr. Hogben's scale. I am directed to express our approval of the liberal staffing proposed. The Auckland teachers regard that very favourably indeed. Then, with regard to the appointments of infant mistresses as provided for in the proposed scale, we think that if that was adopted there should be provided at the same time some arrangement by which our staffing should be reorganized. The pay of infant mistresses would in come cases act unfairly in Auckland, owing to the fact that the appointments of infant mistresses in the past have been largely a matter of chance. A young teacher has usually been appointed to the position, whilst the first lady assistant has for the most part had a larger and upper standard, and if the proposal of Mr. Hogben is adopted comparatively young teachers will in many cases receive large increases of pay over the heads of much more deserving teachers.

2. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Have you studied the alternative scale submitted, and its effect on the teachers here?—Yes. I think some fifty-three schools would be affected by the proposed change to give an assistant teacher at forty. Of those fifty-three schools, thirty-one would have the help taken away under the second proposal. Teachers of the medium-sized school favour the original proposal rather than the subsequent one.

3. What is the proportion of boys to girls now entering the teaching profession?—In my own school girls enter the service every year, but since I have been in charge no boy has done so.

4. Would the inducements of the proposed scale tempt bright boys to join?—If the maximum salary contemplates house allowance, I think it offers a fair reward. If it does not, the Auckland teachers are unanimous in saying that the maximum salary is not large enough.

5. Would you agree to the Inspectors being under a central authority?—I am not prepared to say anything in regard to the Inspectors.

6. Whilst you approve of a colonial scale for teachers, do you think an amount should be fixed by Government for incidental expenses of Commitees?—Yes.

7. Do you think the present methods of promotion offer any encouragement to the teachers in the country?—No; I think a promotion scale must follow the result of your labours.

8. Would you offer any suggestion as to how promotion should be made?—I think that when assistants are appointed they should be granted a living-wage, but not necessarily much beyond it, and I think they should be able to look forward to steady and regular increases.

9. At present that increase could only come by promotion to other schools. Could you give us any suggestions as to the methods of promotion—whether it should be carried out by the Boards or the Government direct?—I think the general principle of promotion should be enunciated by the Government, but that the carrying-out of it should be left to the Boards, and I think the Committees have a right to be consulted in the making of appointments.

10. But by the present method is it not almost impossible for the Board to do anything like its duty in the way of promotion of teachers—is it not largely a matter of Committee buttonholeing?—I do not think so. The Board has the right to make the appointment, and has power to consult the Committee with regard to the appointment of one particular teacher should it consider that that teacher has strong claims to promotion.

11. Does the Board do it?—Yes, the Board has done it.

12. Have you considered the question of conveying pupils from one centre to another in the country?—I certainly think that one strong school is infinitely better than two weak schools.

13. How have half-time schools answered here?—Very well, I think.

14. Do you believe in teachers being paid on the average attendance, or do you think it is more just that they should be paid on the roll-number?—I think that they should be paid on the attendance, but that the average should be fixed higher than at present. I think two-thirds instead of one-half would be fair.

15. What is your opinion in regard to female teachers teaching the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards?—We have female teachers in Auckland who manage these classes excellently, but it is an exception.

16. Have you noticed whether or not teachers have been raised by figure as much in this educational district as in others?—Of late years, I think not; but I have not worked out the percentages.

17. Have you considered the question of a superannuation allowance for teachers?—I think it is highly necessary. We have thought of no plan, but have tried ineffectually to arrive at one with the insurance officers.

18. Assuming that the scale of salaries paid is something on the lines now being considered, would the teachers be able to contribute anything out of that salary towards a superannuation fund?—Yes, I think so, if a house allowance is admitted.

19. House allowance for head-teachers, but not for assistants?—That is so.

20. In the matter of sick-allowance, what is your opinion?—That is a weak point. We have failed to notice an allowance for sick-pay in the proposed scale.

21. *Mr. Davidson.*] You stated that the best class of boys were not entering the teaching service: would you give the Commission your opinion as to why they are not entering?—Simply because the inducements are not good enough.

22. Do you think that a uniform colonial scale of staffs and salaries would do much to remove the unrest and dissatisfaction that you say at present exist amongst teachers?—That is my opinion.

23. Do you notice that though the amended colonial scale only takes in schools of an average attendance of 330 it includes the whole of the 354 schools in Auckland with the exception of seventeen?—I did not notice that point.

24. Taking the smallest group of schools, those under 14, do you approve of the suggestion to grant capitation allowance of £5 per head to those small schools?—Yes.

25. And in schools of 14 to 19, do you notice that the fixed salary is £75, *plus* £5 for each additional unit—I understand you approve of the increase of salary per unit rather than for grade of schools?—Yes, certainly.

26. What is the first form of assistance that should be allowed in a school, in your opinion?—I think, an assistant teacher if possible, but failing that a third-year pupil-teacher. I think it wrong to appoint a first-year pupil-teacher, for the teacher could not properly train that pupil-teacher and attend to the work of the school.

27. But the best assistance would be a certificated assistant first?—Yes.

28. What is the scale of staff allowed by the Auckland Board?—A pupil-teacher at 35.

29. Would you give me the group of schools in which a pupil-teacher is allowed?—Between 35 and 60. At 60 an assistant is appointed.

30. A teacher is asked to teach five more pupils and gets a considerably larger salary; as soon as his school reaches 40 he gets the assistance of a certificated teacher instead of a pupil-teacher: under those circumstances, do you not think that Mr. Hogben's second proposed scale is better than that provided in Auckland?—The alternative scale would mean that thirty-one out of fifty-three schools would loose the assistance they at present have.

31. But does it not also mean that as soon as those schools had an increase of five in average attendance they would get the help of a certificated mistress?—Yes; but many of the country schools cannot hope to get that increase.

32. Do you know of any British colony or any educational district in New Zealand where a mistress is allowed in a school of under 40?—No; that is why I suggested a third-year pupil-teacher.

33. Do you not think that a fairly competent man or woman could manage to teach efficiently 40 children?—Yes, he may; but I think it is asking much of him.

34. Do you know that in some districts of New Zealand a sole teacher is asked to teach and manage up to 50 children?—Yes, I am aware of that.

35. Under this alternative scheme a teacher is only asked to teach up to 40: would not teachers here like to have the better salary and teach alone up to 40 rather than have a lower salary and have an assistant?—Those I have spoken to would not.

36. Take the grade 40 to 65: do you think that the staff allowed here is better than that provided at present in Auckland?—Yes, I think it is a distinct improvement.

37. If it could be shown to the teachers of Auckland that by delaying the appointment of an assistant to 40 instead of as in the first scale introducing the assistant at 35 a saving of thousands of pounds could be made, which would be available for increasing the salaries of assistants throughout the colony, would not that weigh somewhat?—It would weigh with the assistants, but I am not so sure that it would with the country teachers.

38. In your opinion, is the staff at 65 to 90 sufficient?—Yes.

39. And you think that the third teacher—that is, a pupil-teacher in addition to the head-master and assistant—should come in at 90?—I think that is fair.

40. Have you considered the first suggested scale as far as the necessary certificate for the various classes of positions is concerned?—Yes. I may say that in Auckland we do not agree about that. We think, though, that the holder of a degree or higher certificate than D should receive some slight bonus. We would not like to see anything taken off the salary.

41. Do you think that E2 is too high a certificate for a school of 19 to 35?—I am inclined to think it is.

42. What would you suggest in its place?—A grade lower.

43. Do you not think it is too much to expect a man to have taught eleven years before he can be considered fit to take a school of 35?—He can have his D2 in eight years; in eleven years a man can qualify as D1.

44. Do you not think that D2 is too high a certificate to ask for a school of 35?—I do not know that it is, considering the applicants we have for such schools.

45. And what is your opinion as to a D1 certificate being required for a school of 75 to 100?—I think that is too high.

46. If you lowered that certificate to D2 you would require to lower the previous grade also?—I would make D2 the qualification from 35 to 100.

47. You would approve, then, of D1 being made the qualification for the largest school in the colony?—Yes.

48. Do you notice that in the second grade of schools, up to 600, the certificate for the first male assistant is required to be D3, and immediately the school goes over 600 a certificate of B2 is required: what do you think of that?—I think it is a mistake.

49. What is the average attendance at present at your school?—600 this last month.

50. Can you give the average attendance of your Fourth Standard?—About 88 or 90.

51. And the Fifth?—Just under 50.

52. And the Sixth and Seventh combined?—About 35 or 36.

53. Who is in charge of the Fourth Standard?—It is divided between two lady assistants.

54. Do you think that the average woman is capable of teaching and managing a Fourth Standard class of over 50—girls and boys?—No; I do not think it is right that a lady teacher should be asked to teach such a class.

55. It would be injurious to her health to teach such a class for a period of years?—I do not think any lady should teach a class of more than 50.

56. *Mr. Stewart.*] Has the unrest you speak of been of long duration in the Education District of Auckland?—Yes.

57. Has that unrest seriously injured the cause of education in Auckland?—Seriously.

58. Do you think it has had a great deal to do with the great scarcity of male candidates for pupil-teacherships in Auckland?—Yes.

59. If your advice is sought regarding putting clever boys into the profession under existing circumstances, would you advise that the boys should enter the profession?—Certainly not.

60. Do you think it would add security of tenure and induce boys to enter the profession if the matter of salaries was made uniform by Act of Parliament?—Yes.

61. Were you at the meeting of the Council of the New Zealand Institute in Wellington when the vote was taken on the question of a colonial scale?—Yes.

62. What was the effect of the vote?—The motion was carried unanimously with acclamation.

63. The members of the Council included representatives of the Education District of Otago?—Yes.

64. Do you think that the staffing proposed by the scale under the consideration of the Commission would in itself have a good effect upon the cause of education?—Undoubtedly.

65. Do you think that it is a wise thing for too many children to be placed in the charge of one teacher?—It is a very wrong thing.

66. What is lost by teachers having such large classes?—The education of the children suffers and the health of the teacher suffers.

67. Is it possible to give the requisite attention to the education of the child under existing circumstances?—No, certainly not.

68. It is in the interests of public education that some such system of staffing as that proposed should be brought about?—Yes.

69. You are aware that there are a considerable number of small schools in the Auckland District?—Yes.

70. Has it come under the notice of the Institute at any time that too many small schools are being established in this district?—Yes. We think that many small schools in the district might be amalgamated. For instance, in Hamilton one good school could easily be substituted for the two that are there at present—not more than a mile apart, and with a good bridge across the river.

71. Are you aware that throughout the colony, with the exception of Auckland, the appointment of infant mistresses has always been considered an important one?—Yes.

72. Do you think, in the event of a colonial scale being brought into existence, that the question of infant mistresses would be settled by the Boards dealing with the appointments of infant mistresses in the various schools on their merits?—Yes.

73. There should be a readjustment of the staff?—Yes, I think there ought to be.

74. Have you any house allowance at present?—No.

75. Has it been customary in Auckland to make one?—No.

76. Do you think it possible to form a scale without the consideration of that allowance?—No.

77. You will notice that there are 113 schools in the Education District of Auckland without houses, sixty-five in Wellington, thirty-eight in Wanganui, and twenty-nine in Hawke's Bay; so that of all the schools in the colony having no houses attached to them one-third are in Auckland?—Yes.

78. The question of house allowance would be one of vital importance in the matter of rearrangement of salaries?—Of the greatest importance.

79. Can you tell us how many times in the last two or three years the counting-out of days on which less than half of the roll-number has been present has affected the average of your school?—Not once.

80. The present provision is inoperative?—Largely so; but not so much in the small schools where children have to come long distances.

81. Did the measles epidemic have a serious effect on your attendance three years ago?—Yes.

82. Did the exception of half-attendance have much effect on the average attendance?—No, not in my school.

83 In this district is the headmaster allowed absolute control of his staff?—Yes; but I think in the last year or two the Board have made special appointments of infant mistresses.

84. Have the headmasters no power to control that at all?—I think they have; but had they known this increase was to come they would in some cases have made other arrangements.

85. Would you think it wise in the formation of any scale to make any restriction as to the special fitness of a teacher for a particular class?—No; I think that should be left to the master.

86. You spoke of the question of superannuation: do you think it would be possible to arrange for a contributing scheme on the part of teachers while there are thirteen different scales of salaries throughout the colony?—Certainly not.

87. Do you think that there is a time in the life of a teacher when, in consequence of the increase of years, he begins to fail as a teacher?—I have no doubt about that. Very few men are able to do efficient work after they reach fifty. I think arrangements should be made for a retirement at the age of sixty.

88. In the event of a colonial scale do you think it would be possible to deal with the question of retirement?—Yes.

89. Do you think that the present system of certificates is too complicated?—Yes.

90. You hold a degree?—Yes.

91. Do you think it helps you one bit to have your qualification of the degree reduplicated as B?—No.

92. Do you think it would meet the whole case if there were first- and second-class teaching certificates, and that the first and second degree examinations should be taken as extra qualifications by themselves?—Yes, I should be quite satisfied with that.

93. Do you think that any confusion arises in the minds of Committees in consequence of the present complicated system?—Yes; I know instances of where Committees have mistaken the significance of the figures attached to the letter.

94. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider that taken as a whole the teachers of the Auckland District are adequately trained for the services they render?—No.

95. Is it not a fact that the schools of the Auckland District are considerably overstaffed?—I think not.

96. Why should you so conclude, seeing that in Otago there are sole teachers teaching up to 45 or 50, all standards represented? Is it that the teachers here are not so efficient?—I do not think it shows that. The teachers of Otago and Southland have too much work.

97. If you pay larger salaries you attract the most efficient teachers, who can overtake the work?—That is so.

98. Consequently, the Otago and Southland teachers may be more efficient than the Auckland teachers are to-day?—I am not prepared to admit that.

99. Have you had any experience of small country schools?—In a school of 100 only.

100. Is it a fact that the Teachers' Institute, or, rather, the teachers who are engaged in country schools, admit that they cannot teach more than 36 pupils without assistance?—I do not think they admit they cannot do it, but they think it is asking too much of them and that the children suffer.

101. Supposing that you put in an assistant when the attendance reaches 36, is it not a fact that these will be the most expensive schools to work?—Yes, particularly if you put in an assistant.

102. Could you give us an idea of the number of schools in the Auckland District with an average attendance of less than 40?—I think there are about 208 out of 353.

103. If mistresses are put into the schools at 36, does it not stand to reason that the salaries of the teachers in all these 208 schools will be less than if the assistant was not brought in till the attendance reaches 41?—Yes, that follows.

104. Do you not consider that in the Auckland Education District there are too many pupil-teachers?—I do.

105. Does the Auckland Board give a preference in the appointment of female teachers?—No, I think not.

106. How do you account for the fact that a large proportion of teachers in the Auckland District are females?—Simply that the profession does not offer enough attraction to males to look forward to.

107. Are there not enough males offering for teacherships in schools of 35 to 50?—I think it is difficult to fill these schools with males; but for the better class of schools there are a large number of candidates.

108. With regard to the payment of female teachers, I think you stated that the Institute was not in favour of equal pay for equal work, but that it was in favour of reducing the difference as far as possible?—Yes.

109. What do you consider to be a fair difference?—I could not speak for the Institute on that point—there has been no difference decided upon.

110. Do you consider personally that a difference of 10 per cent. would be too much, or would it be adequate?—I think that would be sufficient.

111. You said that the teachers, as far as you knew, had not discussed the matter of centralising the Inspectors?—That is so.

112. Do you not consider personally that it would be for the advantage of education generally—in the interests of the teachers and the scholars—that the Inspectors should be placed under a central department, so as to secure uniformity of inspection and examination?—Yes, I think so.

113. I suppose you are aware that a resolution was passed at the Conference of Inspectors favouring that?—Yes.

114. Do you find that the Inspectors in this district do not promote the teachers as fast as they do in other districts?—I think the rate of promotion has not been so rapid here for the last three or four years.

115. Would you approve of the system adopted in Otago and other places of the Inspectors declining to assign marks sufficient to give Division I. to a teacher who has never done other work than assistant's work?—Yes.

116. You consider that a teacher should require to work through a country school and have been in charge of a school in order to get Division I.?—Yes.

117. Would you favour the differentiation of work required in small country schools where the teacher is unaided from that required in a fully staffed town school?—I think the test should be the same for the whole colony, but I think the Inspector might take less brilliant results in a school where the teacher was unaided than elsewhere.

118. Do you think we should have uniformity of pupil-teacher examinations throughout the colony?—Yes.

119. What efforts are made here in the way of preventing truancy?—A Truant Officer is appointed at an annual salary, and teachers make monthly reports to him.

120. Do the pupil-teachers in this district experience any difficulty in getting the necessary training—such as can be obtained in North Canterbury and Otago?—Yes.

121. Would you favour the establishment and maintenance by the Government of normal schools in the four large centres of population?—Certainly.

122. And would you favour the establishment of collegiate classes in the smaller towns, like Nelson, Timaru, and New Plymouth?—Yes.

123. Does the Auckland Board give facilities for the transfer of teachers from one school to another?—No.

124. Are teachers paid directly by the Board or through the Committee?—Directly by the Board.

125. Do teachers experience any difficulty in getting their cheques sent to them, or do they have to come to the office to get their money?—I have heard no complaints on that matter. They may have their cheques sent to them, or paid into the bank, or they can call for them.

126. You would not favour a system of payment through Committees?—Certainly not.

127. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Do you think the teachers in this district would rather accept the first proposed scale of staffing and get smaller salaries, or the second proposed scale and receive as good pay as is granted in any district in the colony at the present time?—There is a difference of opinion in regard to that. Teachers in the smaller schools—of 35 to 40—object to the second proposal, and so, I think, do the teachers of schools ranging from 200 to 300; but there is another class again which favours the second proposal.

128. You understand that we have only £4 capitation. Are they willing that the scale of pay should be made out on the basis of the Auckland salaries rather than on that of the Otago salaries? No, I do not think so.

129. One or the other must follow: you see that, of course?—Yes.

130. *Mr. Weston.*] Have your answers been given after careful consideration of the subject?—I think so. Some of the questions, of course, have presented the matter to me in a new phase.

131. Why do you object to the power of the promotion of teachers being taken out of the Board's hands and given to the Government? Why should the Government interfere with the promotion and placing out of teachers?—I suppose there is a danger of political influence.

132. If there be a danger of political influence, why do you advocate the Government having anything to do with the placing of teachers?—I advocate their promulgating a general scheme saying on what conditions promotion shall be made.

133. If there is to be a Government scheme of promotion, then the Board and Committees would be powerless, would they not, to recommend teachers for certain positions?—I think that whether a teacher is in the service in Otago or Auckland he should be able to look forward to promotion in any part of the colony.

134. Would that not interfere very much with the powers of the Board?—I do not see that it would.

135. Do you approve of the present system of instruction by pupil-teachers?—No; I think from the nature of things that a pupil-teacher cannot be expected to give the pupils a thoroughly efficient training.

136. You said just now that for a school of 35 you would have assistance of a pupil-teacher?—A third-year pupil-teacher.

137. That would be only a makeshift, would it not?—I do not think so; a third-year pupil-teacher very nearly approaches a certificated teacher.

138. Do you think there are ample opportunities given in Auckland for the instruction of pupil-teachers?—The Board has made regulations for the instruction of pupil-teachers, and those instructions afford a certain amount of training. I do not think it is sufficient.

139. Are the instructions carried out, or can they be carried out, in all the districts?—They are carried out.

140. Can they be faithfully carried out under the circumstances of the various schools?—If you want me to compare our system with that of the training-college, that is another matter. There is no question that the training-college is infinitely better.

141. Am I to understand that in some instances the country pupil-teachers cannot be efficiently taught?—Certainly.

142. Do you think that for the instruction of pupil-teachers it would be better to have a training-college?—Certainly.

143. You would advocate, I presume, the instituting of a training-college in Auckland?—Certainly.

144. Do you think that the number of pupil-teachers is too great or too few for the circumstances of your district?—I would like to see our present ratio reduced to something like that in Mr. Hogben's scale, which I regard as a good one.

145. Small schools up to 40 are taught by both males and females: seeing that the sexes do the same work in these schools, do you think there should be any material difference in their salary?—I think there should be a difference, even for the sake of supply and demand.

146. You do not think, then, that in some of the small schools there should be no difference in salary?—No.

147. What in your opinion should be the minimum salary of a teacher, male and female?—If the teacher is just appointed an assistant I think a living-wage—say, about £75 a year—should be paid. If the teacher was a married man, however, that would not be a living-wage.

148. In what respect do you think there should be a differentiation in the syllabus for smaller schools?—I think less should be required.

149. If asked to revise the syllabus for the small country schools, what subjects would you eliminate?—History, some of the geography, and some of the grammar.

150. For what size of school, then, would you differentiate the syllabus?—For those under sole teachers.

151. Would you approve of a reduction being made in the master's salary through the appointment of a sewing-mistress?—That entirely depends on the rate at which the master's salary is fixed.

152. Say the salary is £75, would you agree to that being interfered with?—Certainly not.

153. Supposing the capitation grant were increased and the Boards had thereby power to increase the salaries, would you still advocate a colonial scale?—Certainly.

154. By reason of its certainty?—Yes.

155. Can you tell me whether any of the country school-buildings would require to be altered or enlarged to enable an amended scale of staffing to be given effect to?—Not so far as I am aware.

156. Do you experience here any difficulty in getting teachers of ability to go out into the country schools?—Yes, I think so.

157. Do the lady teachers suffer serious inconvenience by taking positions in the country schools?—I think there is a very general disinclination to accept such positions, although when they have once done so many prefer the country work.

158. Do lady teachers suffer hardships in any of these country districts?—I think so.

159. Can you give any instance of the hardships suffered by these ladies?—Yes, I could give one or two, but not before a mixed audience.

160. They are so bad?—One particularly.

161. Are these cases of hardships exceptional or frequent?—Exceptional.

162. Do you consider that in the fixing of a colonial scale of salaries for these country schools the inconvenience that the teachers suffer should be taken into consideration?—Certainly.

163. What do you think the amount of sick-pay allowance should be?—I think a teacher who has been seven or eight years in the service should be entitled to a month's allowance.

164. What would be the allowance for every subsequent year of service?—It is very difficult to fix an arbitrary standard at once. I should say a teacher who has put in twelve or fifteen years' service might be entitled to three months' pay.

165. Have you heard complaints made by teachers of the rate of allowances paid to them when sick or to their representatives after death?—No, I have not heard any complaints.

166. *Mr. Luke.*] Have you ever known Committees make the mistake of confounding the figures in a certificate?—Yes.

167. You are a member of the Auckland University Council?—Yes.

168. Do you not think that your position as a Master of Arts and member of that Council is a good thing from the point of view of the profession?—Certainly.

169. Do you think if the assistant teachers throughout the colony were paid on the highest scale at present in existence that it would be a good thing for the colony?—Certainly.

F. H. Brown, First Assistant, Newton East School, examined.

Mr. Brown: I represent the first assistants of Auckland, who are very strongly in favour of a colonial scale, on the following grounds: namely, that the salaries paid to us in Auckland compare very unfavourably with the salaries paid in many of the other education districts, and that the salaries are not sufficient for the work done. I have had a very varied experience in country schools. I have been in charge of half-time schools, schools with an average of 20, and schools with an average up to 80 or 90. I have also been three years as first assistant in Newton East, and I consider that the work done by the assistants in Auckland is heavier than that done in any of my previous positions. Again, the salary paid to us is not sufficient to meet the cost of family expenses. I have five children, and I find my salary of £190 is too small; and to make ends meet I do all my own kitchen-gardening, otherwise I should be in debt. Many of my fellow-assistants eke out their salaries by "coaching." Another point is that at the present time our salaries are fixed at grades of 100 on average attendance. The first assistant's salary in a school of 500 is a certain amount, and does not increase until 600 is reached. During the measles epidemic in 1889, because the attendance dropped below 500, the first assistant suffered a reduction of £25 from his salary.

170. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Have you studied the Otago rate of pay sufficiently to know whether it would suit you or not?—The salaries paid in Otago a year or two back were very much better than ours are at present.

171. I suppose it is not your desire to see any of the salaries in the colony brought down to make an average with low salaries?—Certainly not.

172. If the £4 capitation is not sufficient you think the Government should vote more?—I think education deserves higher payment than it receives at the present time.

173. Do you think assistant teachers, if married, should, in common with head-teachers, receive house allowance?—If they pay us a sufficient salary I shall be content without it.

174. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is the average attendance at your school?—Between 600 and 700.

175. What are your duties as first assistant?—I have charge of the Sixth Standard, and am required to give instruction to the pupil-teachers a certain part of the time.

176. Are you paid for instructing the pupil-teachers?—No.

177. Does the Auckland Board consider it part of your duties to instruct pupil-teachers?—I think so.

178. Is it laid down by regulation?—It is in the hands of the headmaster, and he can make his own arrangements with assistants, I believe.

179. Are headmasters paid any allowance or bonus for instructing pupil-teachers?—No.

180. If the salary paid for your position were raised to £240, would that meet with your approval?—Certainly.

181. Do you think a teacher occupying your position would be fairly well paid at £240?—I think so.

182. How many pupils do you consider a teacher in sole charge of a school with all standards should be expected to teach?—35 to 40.

183. Do you think country teachers prefer the extra strain of teaching, say, 45 and getting fair salaries to having a more liberal staff and a not so liberal salary?—If I was a country teacher I should take the more liberal salary.

184. Are you in favour of giving a retiring-allowance to those teachers who have grown old in the service?—I am.

185. Do you consider it advisable to adopt a superannuation scheme whilst there are thirteen Boards existing, each making its own scale of staffs and salaries?—No, I do not think so.

186. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you know whether the teachers you represent are favourable to the Inspectors being placed under a central department?—No.

187. Do the Inspectors work hand-in-hand with teachers in promoting the interests of teachers?—I think so.

188. Then, the teachers would not work detrimentally to the Inspectors if the Inspectors thought it was to their advantage to come under the central department?—No.

189. *Mr. Weston.*] What in your opinion should be the minimum salary for a male and female teacher in a school of, say, 40?—I should say, £175 a year and a house.

190. Do the teachers generally consider that in computing the salaries of teachers of country schools and assistant masters and mistresses in towns house allowance should be taken into consideration?—Most certainly in reference to country teachers, and, I think, also in the case of assistants.

191. Do you think pupil-teachers can be properly taught in small country schools?—No; because the whole of the headmaster's school time is occupied in looking after the several classes.

192. What is your opinion in regard to the syllabus for small country schools?—It is overcrowded.

193. What subjects, speaking generally, would you delete from the syllabus of small country schools?—History, a considerable part of the grammar and geography, and in the general syllabus a considerable part of the Sixth Standard arithmetic.

194. Have you and the teachers generally considered the question of sick pay and allowances to the representatives of deceased teachers?—No; the subject has not been fully gone into by the first assistants.

195. Are you able to express an opinion on behalf of the teachers as to the allowance that should be made in each of these cases?—I am not.

196. Do you advocate any allowance?—Certainly.

197. What in your opinion would be a fair rate of allowance in the case of sickness and in the case of death?—I have not given the subject enough consideration to properly answer the question.

198. You are so satisfied with your present position that you have not given a thought to that question?—Certainly not.

J. D. McNaughton, Drury School, Representing the Small Schools, examined.

Mr. McNaughton.] One apparent anomaly in the first proposed scale to which a number of us object is that a head-teacher in a larger country school of under 75, with a D2 certificate, can only earn £173 8s., whereas a teacher of a lower grade, with a D3, can earn a salary of £220 in the position of assistant. Country teachers object to proposed scales requiring certificate higher than D to qualify for certain positions. As a rule, they have not the opportunity of acquiring a university degree. In the proposed scale we consider the proposal to deduct £10 for sewing-mistress from the salaries of head-teachers of schools under 40 would act very injuriously. The appointment of the sewing-mistress rests with the head-teacher, and it would doubtless lead to his getting into conflict with local authorities. We consider that a classification scheme is inseparable from a salary scheme; that our present salaries are insufficient; and that they have been so in the past, and are more so now, owing to the increase in the cost of living, although a general advance has taken place in the salaries of other classes of workers. In schools of under 40 where the whole of the standards are taught, instead of an assistant at 40 we consider that a third-year pupil-teacher should be appointed from, say, 36.

199. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—Fifteen years—as pupil-teacher and teacher of schools, with roll-numbers from 20 to 70.

200. What is your present position?—Teacher of a school with an average attendance of 50.

201. What is your staff?—One pupil-teacher.

202. Under the suggested scale what would be the staffing of your school?—An assistant mistress.

203. Would you prefer to have an assistant mistress who would take the responsibility of the infants and Standards I. and II. rather than a pupil-teacher?—Yes; in my case the pupil-teacher is a qualified assistant, *i.e.*, she has a certificate.

204. Practically, the Auckland Board is giving a teacher the position and salary of a pupil-teacher when really she is an assistant?—Yes.

205. Do you think that is a right thing to do? Would you not rather have a qualified assistant doing the work and receiving the salary of an assistant?—For her sake, yes. In my case it would not affect the actual work done, although, no doubt, she would do better work if paid a better salary.

206. You are not giving her instruction in the art of teaching or for examination?—No.

207. If your suggestion were carried out that a pupil-teacher instead of an assistant should be appointed at 36 you would have to train that pupil-teacher in the art of teaching and prepare her for her examinations, would you not?—Yes.

208. Would you not prefer to teach an additional 4 children and at 40 get the assistance of a qualified assistant rather than take a pupil-teacher to whom you would have to give instruction?—Certainly.

209. Then, I take it you prefer the colonial scale which does that?—Yes.

210. Are you satisfied with the salaries for head-teachers in the second proposed scale with the exception of the deduction for sewing-mistresses?—On the whole, yes.

211. The salary suggested for infant mistresses is very much larger than that provided by the Auckland scale: do you think that an improvement and likely to bring into the service more highly qualified women?—Yes; but I think it is likely to have a reactionary effect.

212. In what way?—Many of our smaller schools are staffed by ladies who have gone into remote country districts and are induced to remain there by the relatively higher salaries. If these assistant-mistress-ships are increased in value there would be greater competition for them. You would have in schools from 75 to 100 in average attendance lady teachers more willing to occupy the position of assistant mistress than that of sole teacher in a remote country school.

213. Do you not think that would be a good thing, inasmuch as it would give a more highly trained set of mistresses in these schools than at present?—Yes; but it would have a bad effect on the small country schools.

214. *Mr. Stewart.*] You referred to the question of friction arising out of the appointment of sewing-mistresses: you infer that the headmaster will have the appointment of the sewing-mistress? The note says that the teacher's wife shall have the preference.

215. But the Board, of course, has the appointing?—They have the confirmation of the appointment, and I take it that if the teacher's wife is suitable the Board would be compelled to appoint her.

216. Does the half-day exclusion in the computation of the average attendance adequately meet the difficulty?—No.

217. Would the suggestion of a three-fifths or two-thirds exclusion be an improvement?—I think so.

218. It would prevent undue fluctuation of salaries?—Yes.

219. And the country teachers, do you think, would be in favour of the altered conditions?—Yes.

220. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you think the proposed scale of allowance for pupil-teachers is sufficient?—I think in many cases where they have to go into remote country districts it is not sufficient to enable them to pay their way.

221. Do you consider that head-teachers should receive payment for instructing pupil-teachers?—Yes; I think a bonus should be paid on the pupil-teachers passing.

222. A bonus of a certain sum if the pupil-teacher passes, and half that if he fails?—I think so.

223. What do you consider would be a fair salary for a teacher in your position?—I consider that a fully qualified teacher in charge of a school should receive not less than £200 per annum.

224. *Mr. Weston.*] Irrespective of size?—I think the man should be paid, and not the school.

225. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you approve of teachers being paid according to the certificate they hold?—No.

226. Do you think that assistance at 36 tends to lighten the teacher's work?—Yes, materially, if the pupil-teacher has had some experience.

227. What salary are you getting?—About £150.

228. And your pupil-teacher?—I believe, £45.

229. According to the No. 1 scale your salary would be £159 and the mistress's £80, and by the amended scale your salary would be £170 and that of the mistress £90: do you think that the adoption of this suggested scale would on the whole materially benefit the country teachers in Auckland?—Yes.

230. Are the country teachers in favour of the proposed deduction being made by way of penalty if they do not hold the minimum certificate?—They are very much opposed to it.

231. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you think there should be any differentiation in the syllabus for the country schools?—Not in pass-subjects. I think in schools with a sole teacher that the syllabus might be relieved of science, history, and grammar, the latter by being curtailed considerably.

232. Are you satisfied with your position as a country-school teacher?—No; I consider my present salary is not sufficient to make provision for myself and family, and the chances of promotion are not evident. I also think that the work required by the syllabus is too great to be overtaken by country schools. I refer, of course, to the additional subjects.

233. Have you taught any pupil-teachers?—Yes.

234. Are you able to give pupil-teachers the time and attention they ought to receive at your hands?—No. Our regulations require us to set apart a certain amount of time during the day for instructing pupil-teachers. That is practically impossible where a teacher has charge of four or five classes.

235. Do you think that there should be a time-limit to a pupil-teacher's duties in a school—that they should have so many hours teaching-work and the rest reserved for private study?—That is impracticable, I think, for they are required for the supervision of class-work. The staffing would not allow it in the country districts.

236. *The Chairman.*] Have you a house at your school?—Yes.

237. What is it worth?—Houses from a renting point of view are practically valueless in Drury.

238. Are the Saturday classes for pupil-teachers in Auckland doing good?—Yes; they are a great help.

239. Do you approve of the proposal to take capitation by units?—Yes; it would be an improvement as compared with the present method.

240. Have you a sewing-mistress in your school?—The pupil-teacher does the work of sewing-mistress.

JAMES ARMSTRONG, Headmaster, Devonport School, examined.

Mr. Armstrong: I am asked to come on behalf of the headmasters of the city and suburban schools, and I have also been requested to represent the case of the second assistants before you. With your permission I will read the following statement of the headmasters of the city and suburban schools: "We, the undersigned headmasters of schools under the Auckland Education Board, respectfully ask you to consider the raising of the maximum salary provided for in the proposed colonial scale. Under that scale, as issued, no headmaster in the Auckland District would receive a salary of more than £349 per annum. We respectfully submit that in a district in which nearly eight hundred teachers (of whom 353 are in responsible charge of schools) are employed, we may reasonably ask that a few prizes of greater value than those proposed may be offered. We may remind the Commission that until September in last year the Auckland Board of Education paid at a rate which made at least seven of the largest schools worth upwards of £350, the two largest being worth over £400. Retrenchment then took place, and the scale adopted is still in force, although by the distribution of the bonus voted by the Government salaries have been reinstated at practically the former rate. This is fair evidence that that rate is not considered excessive by either Board or department. The proposed colonial scale will further reduce the higher salaries even below the scale to which they have been reduced by the Board. It appears to us to be cruel to lower the salaries of the department's oldest and most experienced servants save for the most pressing reason. Could it be shown that the state of the colony's finances demands retrenchment we should be willing to submit to such reduction as might be deemed necessary. But such is not the case. In almost every calling wages are being increased, and in our own district assistants and many country teachers are to receive a well-merited increase. In addition to this, the cost of living is now considerably greater than it was two or three year ago; yet, though the finances of the colony are in a flourishing condition, some of us are threatened with a reduction in salary that will not only materially alter our own circumstances, but will seriously affect the prospects of our children. Many of us, moreover, relying on the maintenance of the scale under which we were appointed, have incurred pecuniary responsibilities from which it is impossible for us now to withdraw. We would further point out that it is the maximum salary offered that influences candidates for the teaching profession. Other callings offer far greater prizes than does ours; hence many of our clever boys who would otherwise enter our ranks are diverted into other walks of life, and the colony is the loser. In conclusion, we respectfully submit that we hail with satisfaction the improvements proposed in the salaries of hitherto underpaid teachers, and should have been perfectly content had our own salaries been left as they originally were. But we think it a real grievance that in a scheme which was intended for the better payment of the teaching profession generally the most experienced and responsible servants of the Board should receive as their share a substantial reduction in salary." I might say that this letter was written under the supposition that the salary as stated in the scheme represents the actual salary that teachers would get, and we were not aware that anything was being done in the matter of house allowance. I may say that it is the general opinion of headmasters that if house allowance was made that we should consider the loss in the salaries from a different point of view, but if no house allowance is made we feel that our salaries have been very considerably and substantially reduced, as pointed out in that letter.

241. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] In the last report of the department your salary is stated at £342: what is it now?—£324.

242. Why were you reduced?—No reason was given.

243. What is the average attendance at your school?—500 to 530.

244. Under the suggested scale what would you get?—£319.

245. What is the present staffing of your school?—Six assistants and six pupil-teachers.

246. What do you think would be the effect on the teaching profession of the colony if the staffing remained as liberal as in Auckland and the salaries were materially increased?—A good effect.

247. Do you think the standard of the teaching profession in this district might be raised by a more liberal scale of salaries being paid?—Undoubtedly.

248. Do you think it would induce a brighter class of youths to enter the service?—I think so.

249. Do you agree with the statement that the average woman is not physically fit to cope with the work of the Fourth and higher standards?—Yes.

250. *Mr. Stewart.*] With regard to the proposal in the suggested scale before the Commission are you in favour of the alternation of male and female teachers as proposed?—No.

251. Do you think it would be better to classify the male teachers as first, second, and third male assistants, and the females as first, second, and third female assistants?—I approve of that.

252. What is your opinion of the present system of the classification of teachers?—I think it is very unsatisfactory.

253. In what way?—In the first place, although I would give every possible consideration to those who have obtained degrees and willingly see them obtain a bonus, at the same time I think it is unnecessary that the degrees should be regarded in the certificate. I also think that the Inspector's marks 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 is a most clumsy way of expressing the Inspector's opinion of the efficiency of a teacher.

254. Do you think there should be twenty-five grades of teachers as at present?—No, most decidedly.

255. Would you prefer to see a small general reduction on teachers' salaries and have that certificate line left out?—I would have no objection to it.

256. Do you consider the half-day attendance sufficient allowance to meet the case of epidemics and wet days in computing the average attendance?—No; I advocate two-thirds.

257. Would you tell the Commission how many days in your school in the past two years the exemption has altered the working-average?—So far as I can remember, four times, but I think that number would also answer the question if you said seven years.

258. Does the exemption really affect the case of epidemics?—No.

259. And consequently the Boards have been losing large sums of money through having to make allowance for epidemics?—Yes.

260. *Mr. Stewart.*] You have examined the scale and noticed the maximum salary set down against any head-teacher?—Yes.

261. The opinion of the Institute is that it is not a high enough maximum?—Yes; I am speaking for the headmasters.

262. Would not the £50 house allowance change their opinions?—Yes, I think so, if it was assured.

263. With regard to the question of a superannuation scheme, do you think that in the public interests it is necessary to retire teachers from the service, say, at the age of sixty or sixty-five?—I think that opinion is universal among teachers.

264. Could a contributing scheme be arranged whilst we have thirteen different scales in operation throughout the colony?—No, it could not.

265. If a colonial scale was in operation, do you think that such a scheme could be established?—I think it could and that it should.

266. With regard to the question of multiplication of small schools, you as a teacher have had a great deal of experience, have you not?—Yes, I have had a good deal of experience, but have not been in many country schools.

267. You were headmaster at Kawakawa?—Yes.

268. Do you think that small schools have been unnecessarily multiplied?—Yes, notably in such a place as Hamilton.

269. Do you know the district of Pokeno?—No; I have heard that the schools are considerably multiplied.

270. Do you know the district of Flat Bush?—Yes.

271. You were headmaster at Otahuhu?—Yes.

272. Flat Bush is an adjacent district, is it not?—Yes.

273. Is it a fact that there was a central school there for some time?—Yes.

274. What happened to it?—It was closed.

275. What became of the pupils attending that school?—I am not in a position to say.

276. Are there two schools now where formerly there was one?—Yes.

277. Do you think one central school better than two small ones?—Yes.

278. Do you know the district of Mangere at all?—Yes.

279. Do you know the position of two schools there?—Yes.

280. Do you think that dividing the Mangere district into two schools within two miles of each other is a wise proceeding?—I could not criticize the wisdom of that state of things; it was, no doubt, in accordance with the wishes of the people. I think one school could easily do the work of the two.

281. Do you know anything of the American system of conveyance of children to a central school, a system carried out also in Australia?—No, I do not.

282. Do you think that in the Education District of Auckland it would be possible to lessen the number of small schools by conveying the children from extremes of districts to a central school?—I dare say it would be possible; I have not considered the matter.

283. You know the districts of Chelsea and Northcote, do you not?—Yes.

284. Would it be possible to have a central school there and a means of conveyance for the children?—I should hardly be inclined to favour it. Of course, I have not had time to consider the matter, and I should like to do so.

285. In the Auckland Provincial District is there any payment made for the tuition of pupil-teachers?—No; it is part of the headmaster's duties.

286. He is remunerated, of course, for the tuition, within the salary paid him for his headmastership of the school?—Yes, I presume so.

287. Are you aware that in some districts of the colony special payment is made for the nstruction of pupil-teachers?—Yes.

288. Which do you think would be the better plan, so far as the payment of pupil-teachers is concerned—to include the duties of the instruction of pupil-teachers within the salaries paid to the headmasters of schools, or to rate them with lower salaries and pay them a certain sum of

money on the number of pupil-teachers passing their examinations?—I think it better to include the payment of pupil-teachers within the salaries paid to the headmasters.

289. Do you think that the fact of payment for instruction of pupil-teachers being included within the salaries in that manner would in any way interfere with the due performance of a master's duties in instructing pupil-teachers?—Undoubtedly not.

290. You believe that a teacher would conscientiously endeavour to discharge that duty without the incentive of special reward?—Yes, discharge the duties as conscientiously as can be.

291. Do you believe in the differentiation of the syllabus in regard to different-sized schools?—Yes, I do; I do not believe in making the standard pass any different. I think in country schools the work of what are called class-subjects and additional subjects should be distinctly lightened.

292. Do you believe in the standard pass?—That is another question; I mean so long as the standard pass is in existence.

293. You think it would be possible to improve the education by having fewer subjects?—Yes.

294. You think that fewer subjects handled in a thorough manner better than many handled in an indifferent manner?—Yes.

295. Then, you believe in the differentiation of the syllabus for different classes of schools?—Yes.

296. Something has been said this morning in reference to the treatment of teachers during sickness: do you consider in your district that this question is on a satisfactory basis?—I hardly think it is.

297. Will you indicate to the Commission in what direction it is unsatisfactory?—Like the president of the Institute, I have not gone into the question in a way that would warrant me in giving an authoritative statement. I think there is a certain amount of uncertainty about the consideration a sick teacher would meet with.

298. Are you aware if there is any rule or regulation, or are applications treated separately or individually?—There is no regulation; they are treated separately.

299. Do you think it would be a more wise proceeding to have a separate rule or regulation in reference to the matter?—Yes.

300. Do you think it would be an advantage to the District of Auckland, and also the District of Wellington, if training-colleges were established?—Yes.

301. Out of what funds would you propose to carry on the training-colleges?—That is hardly a question for teachers to give judgment upon. I think if a fund was secured for the carrying-on of training-colleges they would undoubtedly be of great advantage.

302. You would not advocate that the funds for them should come out of the ordinary maintenance funds?—No.

303. Why not?—I have not considered the question.

304. Does it not practically mean that if training-colleges were established they would be established out of the maintenance funds, and that they would be a further distress on the general finances and on the payment of teachers?—Yes.

305. You are aware that some years ago a special grant was made by the House for training-colleges?—Yes.

306. Is that the proper course for the House to take—to consider the question?—Yes; to have a special grant for training-colleges, and not interfere with the ordinary maintenance funds.

307. Speaking of male pupil-teachers, do you think at the present juncture you would advise parents in the Auckland District to allow their boys to enter the profession?—No; I have had no need to offer that advice, however, for they never allow their sons the opportunity. In seven years I have only had one boy enter the teaching profession.

308. Do you think that is a desirable state of affairs?—No.

309. What do you put it down to?—Want of inducement for the boys to enter.

310. The uncertainty with regard to future remuneration?—Yes, that would affect the advice that a teacher would give, no doubt. The boys are hardly aware of that phase of the question though they feel that there is a want of inducement.

311. In the matter of a colonial scale you consider that it would be safer to trust to the vote of the House each year?—Yes.

312. Practically, there is a vote of the House every year now?—I believe so.

313. *Mr. Luke.*] In reference to a remark you made as to the shortening of the syllabus in country schools, would that make any difference to the education of the children?—No.

314. Do you not think that children attending small country schools should receive as good instruction as the children attending town schools?—Yes; I think they would receive better instruction if less was tried, because more would be achieved.

315. What is you opinion as to equal pay for equal work in the matter of male and female teachers?—As a general principle, I think a male teacher should get more than a female teacher, and I may say that is generally the opinion among the lady teachers to whom I have spoken on the matter; of course, up to a certain point.

316. You have studied the two suggested scales put forward?—I have examined them.

317. Do you approve of the principle in No. 1 scale of the paypent of capitation by units rather than by leaps of 5 or 10 in attendance?—I am hardly prepared to express a definite opinion as to which is the better method of the two. I have not studied the matter.

318. Mr. Hogben points out that in the suggested alternative scale through the staffing being reduced there will be enough money to pay the assistant teachers up to the highest scale paid throughout the colony: you are of the opinion that that would be desirable?—Yes, I am.

319. You do not think that the teachers in the Auckland District receive adequate remuneration for the work they perform?—No; I think all the assistant teachers require higher salaries, and perhaps more than any of the female assistants.

320. In regard to the Saturday classes for pupil-teachers, do you know anything of the work done?—I know a little indirectly.

321. Is it satisfactory?—Yes, and a very great help.

322. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to the question of equal pay for equal work, is it not a fact that a female teacher can as efficiently as a male teacher manage a small country school of an attendance of from 25 to 30?—Yes.

323. Then, would you not consider that she should receive equal pay with a male teacher?—I think the idea is good theoretically. As a matter of fact, I think some of the male teachers of those schools are married men, and it would be impossible to ask a teacher who is married to live on the same salary as is paid to an unmarried teacher.

324. Then, you would advocate giving a bonus on matrimony?—Yes.

325. What is the average attendance at your school?—From 500 to 530.

326. Your attendance is on the increase?—No; it increases at certain times of the year, but decreases towards Christmas.

327. According to the last report your average was 492: it has increased since then?—That is a misleading number; it was actually over 500.

328. How many pupils have you in Standard VII.?—Only 1 or 2 at the present time; sometimes I have 30.

329. Do you group Standards VI. and VII.?—Yes.

330. Who takes charge of them?—The first assistant.

331. A male?—Yes.

332. How many pupils have you in Standard V.?—87.

333. Who takes charge of that class?—The second assistant—a male.

334. You have two male assistants?—Yes.

335. How many pupils have you in Standard IV.?—80.

336. Who has charge of the standard?—The first female assistant.

337. What salary does she receive?—£75 a year.

338. Has she any assistance?—A pupil-teacher.

339. Regularly?—Yes; and the second assistant has the same assistance.

340. How many pupils have you in Standard III.?—78.

341. Does a female assistant manage that class unaided?—No; she gets partial assistance during the greater part of the day.

342. How many pupils in Standard II.?—75, under the charge of a fourth-year pupil-teacher.

343. At what salary?—£55, including £10 allowance for board, &c.

344. Do you consider that a fair remuneration?—No, I do not.

345. How many pupils in Standard I.?—75, under the charge of a female assistant.

346. Does she receive any assistance?—She gets all the assistance I am able to give.

347. What is her salary?—£70.

348. How many have you in the preparatory classes?—160.

349. You have a mistress and two pupil-teachers for that class?—Yes.

350. Did you compare the staffing under the proposed scale with the staffing at present obtaining in your school?—I did not compare it very exactly; I understand it is very much the same.

351. There is a preponderance of females in your school?—Yes.

352. Both in regard to assistant teachers and pupil-teachers?—I do not think more than in any other large school.

353. How many assistants have you altogether?—Six.

354. How many are females?—Four.

355. How many pupil-teachers have you?—Six.

356. How many of them are females?—Five.

357. Do you not consider that is too much of a preponderance of the female element?—I would like one more of the opposite sex.

358. Do you consider that a female teacher can efficiently manage Standard IV.?—No; in my case it is exceptional.

359. Do you consider it would be advisable to have a third male assistant to take charge of Standard IV.?—Yes, in a large school.

360. What is the maximum attendance in a school to be taught efficiently without duplication of the classes?—I do not split my classes up, and I have nearly 600 on the roll.

361. Then, you consider 600 about the type of school in which organization can be efficiently maintained, and in a school of a greater attendance the classes would have to be duplicated?—Yes, though in large schools you would have a greater number of assistants, and so be able to divide the classes with advantage and have better results.

362. Do you find, on looking at the suggested scale, that the teachers as a whole will benefit in this district?—Yes, the teachers as a whole; but the headmasters of the larger schools would not benefit.

363. What salary would you receive according to the suggested scale?—£319.

364. And you would get a residence?—There is nothing to tell me that; if I was sure of it I should be satisfied.

365. Do you find as a whole that the head-teachers approve of a colonial scale?—The head-teachers of the larger schools to whom I have spoken naturally spoke about the manner in which it would affect them, and, of course, it was not satisfactory. With regard to the scheme as a whole, they considered it would do great good if adopted, and especially in the case of hitherto underpaid country teachers.

366. In the Auckland District are residences provided for the head-teachers?—In most of the country schools; there are 113 schools without residences.

367. Is there any allowance made to a master who may be in the unfortunate position of having been appointed to a school that has not a residence?—There is no house allowance; the head-teachers are paid on the average attendance, and if there be a residence so much the better, but it is simply a happy accident.

368. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Has the Institute gone into the matter of the Board's incidental expenses?—No, not so far as I am aware.

369. *Mr. Weston.*] You read from a paper that the teachers would have been satisfied but for recent reductions?—Not the teachers, but the head-teachers of the city and suburban schools.

370. What about the country schools?—I was not speaking for them.

371. Do you know anything of them?—Yes, I know a good deal.

372. Would the teachers in the country schools have had reason to be satisfied with the salaries allotted them but for the recent reductions by your Board?—No.

373. Then, the country teachers are dissatisfied?—Yes.

374. And were dissatisfied before the recent scale was in operation?—Yes.

375. The teachers of the larger schools were not dissatisfied?—Not until the Board made the recent reductions; if the salaries had remained as they were nine months ago we would not have been dissatisfied.

376. I think you stated that the fewer the subjects embraced by the syllabus the better would be the results achieved by the children?—Yes, in small country schools.

377. Would not the same remark apply to the town schools?—Yes I think the syllabus is overcrowded.

378. In what respect do you think it is overcrowded?—There are so many subjects at present that they cannot be taught in a thorough and efficient manner, I think.

379. You think that the syllabus should be purged of some of the subjects?—Yes, undoubtedly.

380. You stated that pupil-teachers were very often in charge of classes, did you not?—Large classes, yes.

381. Do you think that is in the slightest degree to be justified?—No, except in cases of necessity.

382. Why do you consider it is not to be justified?—For the reason that a pupil-teacher has not the authority or the experience necessary to take charge of a large class.

383. Did you consider the physical and mental condition of the teacher when you made that remark?—Yes.

384. Apart altogether from the benefit the children may derive from the instruction of a pupil-teacher, do you not think it is unfair to the pupil-teacher to exact so much from him?—Yes.

385. Does it not keep a male or female pupil-teacher back in their own preparatory training?—Yes.

386. You think, then, the whole system is radically bad?—The system of putting a pupil-teacher in charge of a large class, yes.

387. Have you thought upon the subject of dividing a pupil-teacher's time between teaching and his or her own instruction?—Yes.

388. What is your opinion?—Theoretically, I think it is the proper thing if the Board was able to support the schools so as to allow us to send our pupil-teachers away in order to receive instruction.

389. Do you think it would be a wise plan to allow a pupil-teacher to teach for half a day and allow the rest of the day for private instruction?—Some authorities think that it is the proper thing. I think, myself, it would be going a little too far. I think the Board's rule is a wise one—*i.e.*, that certain pupil-teachers must only teach a certain number of hours a day.

390. In regard to teachers' salaries, do you mean that if the Government kept open a school that the teachers would receive adequate remuneration irrespective of the capitation grant?—It is rather an awkward question to express an opinion upon, but I should say, yes.

391. In regard to increased staffing, can you give an instance where the addition to the staffing would have necessitated additions to some of the country schools?—No, I cannot.

392. Do you consider that the present system of instructing pupil-teachers is efficient?—No; the present system of head-teachers instructing them after school-hours is unsatisfactory, both to the head-teachers and pupil-teachers alike.

393. *Mr. Hogben.*] In regard to the differentiation of the syllabus to which you alluded, do you think that in the case of large schools too many subjects are expected to be taught in the several standards?—Yes.

394. You said you thought the syllabus should be purged of some of the subjects?—Yes.

395. You do not mean by that that those subjects should be cut out of the syllabus altogether?—With the exception of history; I would cut out history altogether.

396. That is your opinion?—Yes, and the opinion of a good many others to whom I have spoken on the matter. The idea is not to underrate the value of the subject, but that it cannot be taught in the time.

397. Would it not be better to allow a choice of subjects?—Yes.

398. Rather than cut out subjects?—Yes.

399. You would prefer to see the choice allowed—some schools to take some subjects, and some to take others?—Yes.

400. It would satisfy the needs of different districts, you think?—Yes.

401. And it would satisfy the aptitude of different teachers?—Yes.

402. In the case of smaller schools with a sole teacher, how many classes would a sole teacher have to look after, including standard classes and preparatory classes?—In some unassisted schools nine classes—six standards and three primer classes.

403. A head-teacher could scarcely reduce the number of classes to five, and certainly not to less?—That is so.

404. Even if you allowed a choice of subjects in the syllabus in the large schools, to produce the same mental results you would require to allow a smaller number of subjects in a school with a sole teacher?—Yes.

405. You would not put those in the subjects which are now called pass-subjects, but in the class-subjects?—Yes.

406. In regard to the question of salaries of head-teachers, what do you mean by the head-teachers suffering: is it solely on account of the house allowance—if the question of house allowance was definitely assured to them the head-teachers in question would not be dissatisfied?—I think not.

407. On page 3 of the suggested scale there is mention of house allowance I presume you saw it?—Yes; but we do not gather from that that house allowance would be assured to us.

408. You mean that if there was no house allowance you would substantially suffer?—Yes, very substantially; we should be reduced—after a reduction.

409. If there was reasonable house allowance given, from £20 to £50, in the case of small and large schools, would they substantially suffer then?—No; I think most of them would be satisfied, though there might be still one or two cases of reduction.

410. Can you tell me a case in which there would be a reduction?—I fancy in the case of two or three of the larger schools in Auckland, though I could not say authoritatively.

411. Will you name one of the larger schools?—The Wellesley Street School.

412. What is the average attendance at that school?—716.

413. Is there any house allowance in a school like that?—No.

414. Under the proposed scale what would be the salary?—£357, I presume.

415. And if £50 was added for house allowance it would amount to—how much?—£407.

416. Then, with reasonable house allowance, such as other Boards give in the case of Wellington, Dunedin, or North Canterbury, the head-teachers in this district would not suffer much?—Well, I was considering the salaries that obtained here six months ago, when the head-teachers received considerably more. I believe the teachers, as a class, will be satisfied.

417. You say "six months ago"?—Six or nine months.

418. Still, under the suggested scale they would be in a better position than they are in now?—Yes, very much.

419. Your first male assistant gets £175, and under the proposed scale would get £210?—Yes.

420. Your second male assistant gets now £100, and under the proposed scale would get £120?—Yes. The second male assistants asked me to lay their case before the Commission; they consider that the salaries they receive, in proportion to the salaries paid to first assistants, are inadequate, when taking into consideration the work they do, and they want to bring that point out.

421. Supposing we raised them, as the alternative scale proposes to do, to £175, would they be in a substantially better position?—Yes, more than they had hoped for, I think.

422. In the staffing under the proposed scale you would gain an assistant and lose a pupil-teacher?—Yes. To be absolutely correct I should explain that one of those whom I call a pupil-teacher is called officially a junior assistant, but it is the same thing practically.

423. You think the substitution of an assistant for a pupil-teacher a great advantage?—Yes.

424. What salary does your infant mistress receive?—At present £100.

425. Do you think that is a sufficient salary to pay an infant mistress?—No. On the other hand, my first lady assistant gets £75 a year, and I consider that her work is worth the same remuneration as the work of the infant mistress. I think the £25 difference in the salaries is too much, and that there should be no difference.

426. You would raise them both?—Yes. I would bring the infant mistresses' salaries up, but not give them as large a salary as is contemplated.

427. Do you not consider the position of infant mistress an important one?—I do; but justice compels me to draw attention to the fact that female teachers doing standard work have a very great strain upon them, and it takes a great deal out of them. Infant mistresses dismiss their classes earlier in the forenoon and the afternoon; they have no written work to correct, and not such strain in the matter of discipline; and they have no hard study at night worth speaking of. On the other hand, lady assistants taking standard classes have frequently to remain till half-past 5 correcting exercise-books and drawing-books, &c. This work is strictly attended to, for I am of the opinion that there is no more conscientious profession in the world than that of the teacher, and I have frequently seen my own assistant remain behind doing work in the manner I stated for a salary of £75 a year.

428. You think it is very desirable to get in the infant-room a woman of originality, and one up to date in kindergarten-work methods?—Yes.

429. I suppose the organization of the infant-room is left very largely in her hands?—Yes.

430. I presume she has to do a great deal of the thinking-work connected with the organization of the infant-room?—I do not think the "thinking" part of it is a great strain on her.

431. I presume you pay for skill, do you not?—Yes. I should be very sorry to be thought to underrate the skill of a properly qualified infant mistress; but I think all the organization an infant mistress has to do is to pick out the children who are fit to go into the next primer class.

432. Does she not discriminate as to what pupil-teacher shall go into a certain room?—Yes; she with the headmaster.

433. You would not be averse to giving equal salaries to an infant mistress and the first assistant mistress in a school with an attendance over 600?—I would be willing to do that; in that case I should like also to see that the infant mistress was a thoroughly qualified person. We

have very few real infant mistresses in the Auckland District; most of them are in the positions they hold by chance or hazard. I think the headmasters have picked out the most suitable, and put them in their positions.

434. *Mr. Davidson.*] Does the infant mistress in the large schools in Auckland not take charge of the sewing?—No; the lady teacher for each class takes the sewing, as a rule.

435. Is she not responsible for the general supervision of the sewing?—No.

436. *Mr. Weston.*] Should not a lady who has exhibited special aptitude for infant-teaching be always kept as infant mistress?—Certainly, I think they should be carefully picked out.

437. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that the infant mistresses that you have in this district are generally unfit for the work they have to perform?—No; and that would be a question the Inspector would answer better.

438. Am I to infer that you think at present the quality of the infant mistresses in this district is unsatisfactory or inferior?—I think, on the whole, through the force of circumstances, the best and most suitable of teachers in that respect have not been found.

439. What has become of them?—They are there, but so far they have not been found.

440. Where are they to be found?—Well, for example, at the present time I have a girl teaching in my school whom I think will make an excellent infant mistress, but who will be lost as an assistant mistress.

441. I understood you to say that the weak point in your schools is that the infant mistresses are unequal to the work?—I do not mean to imply that at all. What I said was that if such high salaries were to be paid them a high standard should be set up.

442. Then, do you think the salaries proposed to be paid to infant mistresses are unnecessarily high?—In the case of a thoroughly skilled infant mistress being appointed I do not think the salary would be unnecessarily high; but, at the same time, I think if infant mistresses are put into those positions in a haphazard manner the salaries would be too high.

443. Do you think if better salaries were offered a better class of infant mistresses would offer their services?—Yes; and they would take more trouble to qualify themselves.

444. Do you think they have the opportunities to qualify themselves now?—No.

445. I understood you to say that a female assistant in a large school, generally speaking, should be paid a salary more than is paid to an infant mistress?—Yes.

446. Do you not think that the breaking-in work an infant mistress has to do requires as much ability as some of the work of an assistant mistress?—No.

447. If you had two before you, an infant mistress and an assistant mistress, whom would you choose for the infant department?—I think the superiority of one person over another must be reckoned on ability to perform certain kind of work: one might be superior for standard work, but, on the other hand, the other might be superior for the work of the infant department.

448. You do believe there are real infant mistresses to be found in the Auckland Education District?—Yes, and very excellent ones.

449. You say you think that the Fourth Standard and upwards should be under the charge of male teachers?—Yes, except under exceptional circumstances. I recognise there are cases in which female teachers are able to take any standard.

450. You are also of opinion that female teachers are quite able to take charge of the lower standards?—Yes; I think they are better adapted for the lower standards.

451. Would you like to see a hard-and-fast rule applied in that respect?—Not altogether. If I had an exceptionally good female teacher who was able to do Standard IV. work well, I should like to be able to put her there; but, on the other hand, that would not prevent me from advocating that the third male assistant should be appointed in large schools, because the chances would be that the male teacher, in the matter of discipline and control, would be better able to manage Standard IV.

452. In the same manner, if you had a good male teacher whom you thought adapted to take charge of Standard III. you would not like to be compelled to put a female teacher in that standard?—No.

453. I understood you to say that you thought teachers should be retired at the age of sixty or sixty-five: do you know of any teachers in this district who have reached that age?—Yes, I know of some.

454. Have you known any who have broken down at sixty?—Yes.

455. From old age or illness?—From overwork.

456. If their work had been lightened I presume they would have been following their occupation still?—Yes, I daresay; but, of course, it depends a great deal on the man himself.

457. Would you prescribe a rigid term at which a man must leave his situation or position in life?—I do not think I would.

458. Do you consider it desirable that there should be a maximum size for schools?—No; it never occurred to me that there should be.

459. You do not see any disadvantage in allowing them to greatly increase?—No, I cannot see any disadvantage.

460. How many children in a school do you think a headmaster is capable of exercising effective supervision over?—I have seen supervision exercised over 1,000.

461. But do you think that supervision could be effective: do you think the headmaster, no matter how capable he may have been, could individualise those children and form an opinion as to the education being imparted to them from day to day?—He had an assistant under him—a highly paid lady assistant—whose business it was to take charge of the lower classes, and to exercise supervision in conjunction with him.

462. But could he possibly take an interest in the children of that school, and exercise an efficient supervision over them, so as to be able to individualise them, and bring himself into daily

contact with them one by one?—He could not individualise them below a certain standard, and I do not think it would be necessary that he should do so if he had a capable assistant.

463. Do you not think it is desirable that the headmaster should watch the individual progress of every child in his school?—Yes; down to a certain point I think so, but, further, I think it is unnecessary.

464. You are of opinion that the system of primary education does not become inefficient when a headmaster has to depend on his assistants, and is not able to devote attention to each of the children in his school?—I would not say that, and I do not advocate that the headmaster should not depend in these cases on an assistant; below Standard III. or Standard II. I think he would necessarily have, in such a very large school as we are considering, to leave much to a skilled lady assistant.

465. With regard to training pupil-teachers, I think the question has been put to you whether you approve of a headmaster receiving a reduced salary and escaping the work of training his pupil-teachers: do you think it reasonable that the headmaster should be paid a bonus for the training of his pupil-teachers?—Yes, I do, if he trains them.

466. I suppose you approve of a colonial scale?—Undoubtedly, we all do.

467. In your opinion, would it improve the positions of the teachers throughout the colony?—Yes.

468. Do you think the adoption of a colonial scale would lead to improved efficiency in the schools?—Indirectly it would; nothing can be worse for teachers than to undertake work to which they should give their whole mind when they are in constant doubt as to what their salaries may be three months hence.

469. In that respect do you think teachers would be safer under the Department of Education than under the Education Boards?—Yes, I do.

470. You think there would be less chance of fluctuation of the payment of salaries?—Yes.

471. You do not think the tendency would be a retrograde one?—I hope not; I do not see why it should.

472. If you do away with the capitation system, and bad times come upon the colony, is there not just as much likelihood of the Government reducing the amounts as the Boards?—Yes, I agree with that; but at the present time, if the prospects are as favourable as they appear to be in the colonies, I think we should take advantage of them.

A. Taylor, Headmaster of the Northcote School, examined.

Mr. Taylor: Speaking on behalf of the headmasters of schools with an average attendance up to 330, I find that the majority of them, with myself, approve of the first scale submitted by the Inspector-General, on account of the extra staffing it proposes to give them. I might point out that at the present time a school with an attendance of some 300 odd pupils is under great difficulties in so far as the matter of staffing is concerned, for the head-teacher, as a rule, has to conduct Standards V., VI., and VII., and consequently has very little time to exercise in supervision. I myself have recently taught Standards IV., V., and VI., each with an average attendance of 66 pupils, and I must say I consider that amount of work too great a strain on the teacher.

473. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you prefer that the Government should have absolute power in fixing the teachers' salaries rather than the Education Boards?—Yes, I do.

474. You are of opinion that there would be less likelihood of the Government reducing teachers' salaries than the Education Boards?—Yes, I think there would be less likelihood of any sudden alteration.

475. Do you think, if the other sums for maintenance were fixed, that there would be less chance of the Boards fluctuating in the matter of salaries?—Yes, I do.

476. If the Government fixed the allowances for maintenance as well as the salaries, do you think that would be more satisfactory?—Yes, I do.

477. Regarding the question of promotion, how do you think that should be carried out?—I certainly think that the Boards and the Committees should have some voice in the matter of the promotion of teachers.

478. That is as it is at present; but it is unsatisfactory in some respects, is it not?—I cannot see any other possible solution.

479. Do you believe that salaries should be paid on the average attendance, the roll-number, or the two-thirds attendance?—On the two-thirds attendance.

480. Have you thought out any plan at all in connection with the question of a superannuation allowance for teachers?—No; I think it is rather a difficult question.

481. Do you approve of a superannuation allowance for teachers?—Yes.

482. Do you think it is impossible to carry such a scheme out?—I think it would be possible if a colonial scheme was in operation.

483. Do you not think that the teachers might have taken into consideration that question of a superannuation scheme, seeing that this Commission is taking evidence here on the advisability or otherwise of introducing a colonial scale of staff and salaries, and that they should have given the Commission some idea of their views on the question?—Yes, I think we might have done so.

484. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is the average attendance of your school?—From 240 to 250.

485. Yours is one of the schools of the group between 200 and 250 in average attendance?—Yes.

486. What has been your teaching experience?—I was second assistant for one year in a large school, and first assistant for six years, afterwards being appointed to my present position.

487. Did you serve an apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher?—No.

488. Were you ever in charge of a small school?—Yes, with an average attendance a little over 100.

489. You approve of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.
490. Your chief reason is that a colonial scale would be liable to less fluctuation in the matter of paying salaries and the staffing of schools?—Yes.
491. When you said that in reply to a former question I suppose you meant that it would be less liable to fluctuation if it were fixed by statute?—Yes.
492. Do you know that the scale of salaries allowed in Victoria is fixed by Act of Parliament?—No, I do not.
493. Then, you do not know also that in Victoria during the last sixteen years there has not been more than one change in their scale?—No.
494. What is your staffing allowed in the school you have?—I may say that on Monday next a change takes place in my staffing, and I get the services of a male assistant.
495. Why?—For the reason that mine is a rapidly increasing school in average attendance, increasing sometimes by 20 in one quarter.
496. Your staffing does not change every quarter?—Sometimes, if there is an increase in average attendance exceeding 25.
497. Do you mean to say that your Board has a regulation allowing for an increase quarterly in the staffing?—Yes, if the average attendance warrants it.
498. Do you not require to maintain an average attendance for two consecutive quarters before your staff is either increased or decreased?—No.
499. How is your staff distributed?—The first assistant, the infant mistress, has charge of the infants and Standard I.
500. How many pupils in average attendance?—I think there are 130 on the roll.
501. Then, probably about 115 in average attendance?—Yes, no doubt.
502. Has the infant mistress a third-year pupil-teacher to assist her the whole time?—Yes.
503. What standards has your next assistant charge of?—Standards III. and IV.
504. What is the average attendance approximately?—About 70, I should say.
505. Your second assistant is a female teacher also?—Yes; she has the help of a first-year pupil-teacher.
506. What about Standard II.?—That standard is in charge of a fourth-year pupil-teacher.
507. What is the average attendance?—Something like 30.
508. You take charge of Standards V., VI., and VII.?—Yes.
509. Under the proposed scale what would be your gain so far as staffing is concerned?—We should gain an extra assistant according to the proposed scale No. 1, and lose a pupil-teacher.
510. You would prefer an assistant to a pupil-teacher, and consider it a distinct advantage over your present staffing?—Yes, certainly.
511. *Mr. Stewart.*] With reference to the question of security in the matter of salaries: supposing Parliament during the last two or three years had reduced the capitation grant from £3 15s. to £3 10s., what effect would it have on the salaries of teachers in this district, or in any other district?—It would, of course, mean a reduction in the salaries.
512. Then, the present system is liable to two sources of reduction—reduction in consequence of capitation, and possible reduction from new scales being introduced by Education Boards?—Yes.
513. If you had a statutory scale you feel that it would give you much more security?—Yes, I am quite sure of it.
514. Do you think that the American system of conveyance of children to a central school, if applied in your district, would work satisfactorily—that is to say, could you work your district with one central school?—I do not think the greater part of my district is any too wide.
515. There is the Chelsea, Birkenhead, and Northcote in your district?—Yes.
516. How far is Helyer's Creek from you?—Something like three miles.
517. How far is Chelsea?—I suppose, about two miles.
518. And Birkenhead?—About a mile and a quarter.
519. Then, if your school, Northcote, be taken as a fixed position for the district, the positions of the other places would be—Birkenhead about a mile and a quarter, Chelsea two miles, and Helyer's Creek three miles from you?—Yes.
520. Have you a school at Chelsea?—No; it was closed some time ago.
521. You do not think there would be any difficulty in working that district with one central school?—I think not.
522. Are the roads good?—Yes.
523. Then, it would be practicable to convey the children to one central school?—Yes.
524. *Mr. Luke.*] What is the reason of the attendance at the Northcote School increasing so rapidly: is it because it is a popular school, or because the population in the district is increasing?—The population is increasing.
525. It is not drawing from the ranks of other schools?—No.
526. You have no school at Birkenhead?—No.
527. Have you ever given any thought to the question of incidental expenses, or what is called the School Fund: do you experience any difficulty in finding money for the upkeep of the schools, &c.?—Not recently.
528. You do not have to resort to entertainments, concerts, or anything of that sort to augment the funds of the School Committees?—No, we do not. As the schools increase in attendance the extra capitation necessarily means an extra grant to the School Committees.
529. You instruct your pupil-teachers?—Yes.
530. Do they attend the Saturday classes held here?—Yes.
531. Do you think the Saturday classes, in the absence of a normal school or training-college, do good work in that direction?—Yes.

532. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long have you been in the employment of the Auckland Education Board?—Nearly fifteen years.

533. During that time how many new scales for the payment of teachers' salaries have been adopted?—I cannot say. We seem to have had a great number that have been promised, but they have never come to anything.

534. Was the general tendency, so far as you remember, to increase or diminish?—I never remember a tendency to increase.

535. Do you not consider that, once a colonial scale was adopted by Parliament for the payment of teachers' salaries, the £4 or £3 15s. capitation grant would entirely disappear, and Parliament would vote a lump sum for the payment of teachers' salaries, in the same manner as it votes a sum to pay the servants in any other branch of the Civil Service?—If it were so I think it would be a very good plan.

536. With regard to the matter of incidental expenses, do you consider that the Government or department should lay down what incidental allowances should be paid to Education Boards, exclusive of teachers' salaries, but just so-much per head capitation by way of meeting incidentals, and that the Boards should allocate it as they think fit?—Yes, I do, certainly.

537. What salary are you receiving at the present time?—£236.

538. What salary would you receive under the suggested scale—the No. 2 scale?—I believe, £260.

539. What staff is there in your school?—Two assistants and three pupil-teachers.

540. Five besides yourself?—Yes.

541. How many of them are females?—They are all females except one first-year pupil-teacher.

542. Do you find that female teachers do the work as efficiently as male teachers in schools other than large country schools, and large classes in the town schools?—Yes, I think so, with the exception of Standards IV., V., and VI.

543. Then, with those exceptions, would you favour an equality in the salary to male and female teachers for equal services rendered?—In the majority of cases I would not.

544. Why the distinction?—I think the physical strain involved in teaching Standards IV., V., and VI. is very great; but at the same time I see no reason why, if a female teacher is strong physically, and the headmaster prefers to put her in charge of Standard IV., V., or VI., she should not receive the same salary as a male assistant.

545. With regard to a sole teacher in a small country school with an average attendance of about 25, do you consider that if a female teacher can as efficiently teach such a school as a male teacher she should receive an equal salary?—Yes, in that case.

546. Then, you consider that both male and female teachers should be paid an equal salary up to a certain point?—Yes.

547. With regard to the payment of teachers on capitation, do you consider that their salaries should be based on the attendance for one preceding quarter or on four preceding quarters—a yearly average instead of a quarterly average?—That is a question on which there is a good deal of difference of opinion. In a district fairly settled the yearly average might be safely calculated, but in a progressive district, with a fluctuating population, there is a wonderful difference in the last and first quarter.

548. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you or the teachers generally read the annual report of the Minister of Education?—No, I think not.

549. In your opinion, what should be the minimum salary fixed under your Board?—£75.

550. For male and female teachers alike?—Yes, in small country schools.

551. You consider that would be sufficient?—Yes.

552. In regard to the head and infant mistresses, your experience has been chiefly confined to large schools?—Yes.

553. Do you consider that there should be any difference made in the positions of a head and an infant mistress?—Such a state of things never came under my notice.

554. What is your opinion on the subject?—There are assistant mistresses, in my opinion, who have very much more arduous work than infant mistresses, the physical strain on them being greater.

555. Do you think there should be any difference in their salaries?—I do not think so.

556. Have you thought anything about the question of sick-pay for teachers?—I have not thought very much about it, though I have often wondered what they would receive if away sick.

557. Do the teachers not discuss the question among themselves with a view to its ventilation?—Not very much.

558. What is the general feeling of teachers on the subject?—I think there is an opinion that some defined rule should be laid down and adhered to.

559. As a matter of fact, there is no rule?—No.

560. Have the teachers as a body considered the question of compassionate allowance to the representatives of a deceased teacher?—The teachers individually have spoken about it, and consider that some allowance should be made. As a body, I do not know whether the Institute has considered it.

561. Have you any side-schools here for infants, and, perhaps, for First and Second Standards?—No, we have none.

562. What is your opinion respecting the treatment of pupil-teachers and their instruction?—I think the staff of assistants should be increased. I have pupil-teachers in charge of classes where, I am of opinion, it would be better to have assistants.

563. Is that practice detrimental to the children in that school and to the pupil-teachers?—Yes, I think so.

564. Why do you think it is detrimental to the pupil-teachers?—I think they are at that particular age when the arduous work and the constant standing all day is too much for them; they might stand it better at the age of twenty-two or twenty-three, but not, as at present, from seventeen to eighteen.

565. Do you think it will prejudically affect them in the acquisition of knowledge, theoretical and practical?—Yes; I think they get tired of it.

566. Have you ever known pupil-teachers in this district to break down?—I have known them to be ill, suffering from a kind of nervous prostration.

567. What is your opinion in regard to the difficulty in obtaining male pupil-teachers?—I think the difficulty is through the parents a good deal, who debar their sons in many cases from becoming pupil-teachers owing to insufficient inducement being held out.

568. Do you think the disposition of the boys in the matter of hard, grinding work has anything to do with it?—It may have something to do with it; I think the work does not present a very inviting aspect.

Miss E. Shrewsbury, M.A., Lady Assistant at Wellesley Street School, examined.

Miss Shrewsbury: Speaking of the proposed colonial scale in a general way, I think it is the opinion of all the lady assistants—and I speak for myself also—that the introduction of it would be desirable. Our chief reason for wishing for the introduction of a colonial scale of salaries, first of all, is that in the Auckland Education District we are not at all satisfied with the present scale, nor have we ever yet been satisfied with any scale that the Board has seen fit to introduce. We think the adoption of a colonial scale will give us a feeling of security, and allay the present feeling of unrest that exists among us, and at the same time will enable us to do our work greater justice. We think, on the broad principles of justice and fairness, that the teachers all over the colony should be paid according to the same scale. As regards the proposed scale that we have seen, we think that the female assistants should start on some minimum or living wage, and that an increase of the salary should follow with additional service and increased ability, the latter being shown by Inspectors' marks and reports; particularly should the length of service count. For certain extra subjects, like drawing and singing, we are of opinion that a bonus should be given. Of course, under the regulations of our Board there is a paragraph stating that consideration should be given to teachers, in regard to salaries, who can teach these extra subjects I mentioned, but I have not heard of any teacher who has received that consideration. We are, very many of us, also of opinion that there should be a bonus on the higher certificates. With regard to that portion of the scale that deals with the payment of male and female assistants, I think the majority of us have come to the conclusion that the difference between the salaries of male and female teachers is inevitable; but at the same time we think all scales we have seen so far make too great a difference between the respective rates of pay. We consider that, at the very outside, the difference should not be more than 10 per cent. or 20 per cent. Then, with regard to the salaries paid to an infant teacher and a standard teacher, in this respect we also think there should not be so great a difference. A standard teacher has to display just as much ability, though we recognise, of course, that an infant teacher has to show special ability; I do not mean to say that the infant teacher should be paid less, but what I think is that the standard teacher should be brought up to the level of the infant teacher. Another thing I notice on looking through the scale is that it proposes to introduce alternative staffing, male and female, but we do not approve of that; certainly I have not had very great opportunities of getting information from many of the lady teachers, but those to whom I have spoken think it is not worked on a right basis. We think there should be double staffing—first male teacher, first female teacher; second male teacher, second female teacher; and so on. We consider this would have a good effect in the matter of paying salaries between male teachers and female teachers, as the difference need not then be so great. Looking at it also from the point of view of advantage to the school, it is likely to have a good effect if the children are trained to look upon female teachers as ranking the same as male teachers; for we consider it a bad thing for the first lady assistant to be looked upon by the children as below the first male assistant.

569. *Mr. Stewart.*] What certificate do you hold?—A1.

570. How long have you been teaching?—Sixteen years and a few months.

571. What class are you teaching at Wellesley Street School?—Standard VII.

572. What degree do you hold?—M.A. with first-class honours.

573. What salary do you receive at the present time?—£100.

574. Is that the highest salary you have ever received?—Yes; and I had to apply two or three times to get that.

575. What standard did you have last year?—Standard VI.

576. And the year before that?—Standard VI.

577. And before that again?—Standards VI. and VII.

578. Going back another year?—Standards V., VI., and VII.

579. What average number of pupils did you have in Standard VI. last year?—About 40; at times there were 60 or 70, but the average would be about 40.

580. What is the average number of pupils you have in Standard VII. at the present time?—30.

581. You take part in the instruction of pupil-teachers?—Yes, and have done so for years.

582. You take the pupil-teachers' class in mathematics on Saturday mornings?—Yes.

583. You get extra payment for that, of course?—Yes.

584. What did your extra payment amount to last year for taking the Saturday morning class in mathematics?—£30.

585. What has your payment amounted to this year, up to the end of the March quarter?—My engagement was dated from the 1st February, and for the first quarter of this year I have received only £5.

586. Did you know that you would have the month of January deducted?—No, I did not know that; if I had been aware of it at first I should not have been willing to accept the appointment. My engagement was dated, as I say, the 1st February, instead of, as I thought, the 1st January, and I lost through that a month's salary.

587. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] In comparing the suggested scale so far as the staffing is concerned, will it make any difference in your school?—I really do not know.

588. What is your average attendance?—Nearly 700 for this quarter.

589. Do you consider that when female teachers perform the same work as male teachers, and as efficiently, that they should receive the same salary, or as nearly as possible the same salary?—As a matter of justice, yes.

590. Have you had any experience in a country school?—No; the smallest school I have been in was from 300 to 400 in average attendance.

591. Do you consider that a female teacher in a large town school could as efficiently teach Standard IV., with an average of 65 or 70 pupils, as could a male?—I think it is a matter of temperament; some men could and some men could not; and in the same manner some women could and some could not. I have seen every bit as good work done in the Fourth and Fifth Standards by female teachers as was ever accomplished by male teachers.

592. You consider that the headmaster of a school should have freedom of organization in the school, as he thinks fit?—Yes, that has always been the case at the Wellesley Street School.

593. Have you compared the suggested scale of salaries with that which is paid in the Wellesley Street School?—Yes.

594. In regard to staffing, how does it compare, favourably or otherwise?—With that alternative scale, male and female, it affects the assistants in our school, male and female downwards, prejudicially.

595. With regard to the certificate you hold, is there any system of promotion adopted by the Auckland Board by which you could be promoted into one of the other town schools?—I do not know whether there is any system of promotion, I have found it impossible to get promotion in my own school.

596. When vacancies occur in your school do they call for applications?—No; two vacancies were occasioned some years ago, and no applications were called for them.

597. Does the Teachers' Institute not take up matters of that sort?—Yes; we asked the Institute to take the matter up.

598. Are there facilities given for exchange of teachers from one part of the education district to another?—I have not heard of any facilities.

599. *Mr. Hogben.*] You stated that in the Wellesley Street School there would be a lowering of salaries for some of the assistants, according to the proposed scale?—Yes.

600. Did you refer to the first proposed scale?—Yes; I have not seen any other. [Alternative scale handed to witness.] I may say I am being paid considerably above the Auckland scale.

601. According to the Auckland scale, what would the first assistant male teacher receive in a school of the size of Wellesley Street?—I think he is paid according to average attendance; I believe his salary is £190.

602. What salary would he receive under the proposed scale?—Under the first proposed scale £280, and under the second £245, I think.

603. What does the second assistant male get under the Auckland scale?—I do not know.

604. There is a third assistant under the Auckland scale, who presumably from the low salary must be a female: is that so?—Yes; in the Wellesley Street School we have first assistant lady, and second assistant lady also; the third assistant's salary would be £95.

605. What would the fourth assistant male get?—£100.

606. What would the fifth assistant get?—£85; that is my position if I were paid according to the scale.

607. What would the sixth assistant get?—£70.

608. And the seventh assistant?—£65.

609. The money saved on salaries by the less liberal staffing, according to the alternative scale, will raise the salaries of assistants here up to the highest level obtaining throughout the colony; do you think the lady teachers in Auckland would feel satisfied with that position?—Yes, I think so.

610. In regard to a bonus for certificates, which you said you thought should be granted, do you not think, in any proper system of appointments, that high certificates carry due weight when teachers are appointed to vacancies?—I do not doubt that, but I do not think they carry an increase of salary. When I spoke of a bonus for certificates I was thinking more of the letter than the figure.

611. You also spoke of a bonus being given for the tuition of extra subjects: would that not, again, if it were granted, tend to make teachers' salaries unequal?—I consider that the teacher, would be doing extra work, and as a consequence should receive extra remuneration. Take singing, for example.

612. Do you think it is harder to teach singing than a good many other subjects?—Well, it is harder to teach singing, for instance, than to give a transcription lesson.

613. Would it be harder than teaching composition?—No; easier.

614. Then, why give more to a teacher who teaches singing than one who teaches composition?—Singing is an outside subject, and such a teacher would need to spend more on herself in order to be able to undertake the tuition of singing.

615. If that training was provided by the Boards in Board schools, would there be any reason then for the granting of a bonus?—Yes, I think so, to a certain extent.

616. In the case of a teacher taking a class in arithmetic, is it fair to give a teacher of drawing a bonus over the teacher of arithmetic?—I look upon drawing and singing as extra subjects.

617. Have you thought out any system of bonuses for these extra subjects?—I think a teacher should receive so-much a year—£5 or £10 a year, say—as special extra payment for these extra subjects.

618. But you have not thought out a system of bonuses for extra subjects?—No.

619. *The Chairman.*] I understand your school is a mixed one?—Yes.

620. Are the boys and girls taught separately?—It depends on the size of the class.

621. Take the Seventh Standard, which is the highest Standard, I suppose, in your school; do you have both boys and girls?—Yes.

622. As far as education is concerned, I suppose you have charge of the most important work that is done in the school?—I should not altogether like to say that.

623. You have been raised by degrees—I mean, you have had charge of Standards III., IV., V., VI., and VII.?—Yes.

624. Which standard has the assistant above you charge of?—There are two lady assistants above me, four teachers altogether, but they are in charge of lower standards; three of them receive higher salaries. The two lady assistants have charge of Standards I. and V. respectively.

625. Do those teachers in charge of Standards IV. and V. receive considerably more salary than you do?—Not considerably more; the lady assistant just above me gets the same salary, and the lady assistant above her in turn gets £20 more. I think one of the male assistants gets more than double the salary paid me.

626. If you had the opportunity, do you think you could fill the position of the male assistant who you say is receiving a salary double what is paid you?—I should not at all mind trying, if the headmaster would allow me; I have done much of the work of a first assistant.

627. Did you ever have charge of Standard III.?—Yes; it was the first standard I took charge of.

628. Leaving out the question of salary altogether, and assuming you were offered the choice of taking charge of either Standard III. or Standard VII., which would you prefer?—I should look upon Standard III. as being in some respects the easier, but not so pleasant. I like teaching the elder children because the work is more interesting, though it is no uncommon thing for me to have to correct papers from 7 o'clock till 12 o'clock at night.

629. You think that the difference between male and female teachers in the matter of teaching is one of temperament?—Yes, I do.

MONDAY, 3RD JUNE, 1901.

W. R. C. WALKER, B.A., First Assistant of the Wellesley Street School, representing the First Assistants of Auckland, examined.

Mr. Walker: I appear on behalf of the first assistants of the Auckland Education District. I am first assistant of the Wellesley Street School. I hold the B.A. degree and B1 certificate. The comments that I should like to make before the Commission are in reference to the scale under which the first assistant masters of Auckland are paid. It will be seen that the first assistant in a school of from 600 to 700 in attendance receives a salary of £190; in a school of 500 to 600, £175; 400 to 500, £150; 300 to 400, £140; 200 to 300, £120, the latter being the school with lowest average attendance at which a first assistant male is introduced. This scale has been in force for about three years; but, even so, it has not been adhered to, at any rate, in one case that I could mention. When this scale came into operation the Board reduced a gentleman I know of £10, and at the same time a gentleman with a lower certificate in a school with a lower average attendance received an additional £10 above the scale. Before this scale came into operation things were in a very much more haphazard state than at present; we then had the anomaly of a first assistant, a man with a degree, getting a salary of £160 a year, while a man with a D certificate in a school with a lesser average attendance received £180. In referring again to this scale I should like to point out that under it the first assistant masters in the Auckland Education District are receiving salaries ranging from 10 per cent. to 25 per cent. lower than what obtains in the South, and we are unable to say why this should be so. We do the same work as assistant masters in the South; we hold, in some cases, higher certificates; and in order to eke out an existence it amounts to this: that in the Auckland District many of the first assistants, and not only first assistants, but other assistants, have to add to their salaries by coaching after hours, work which is detrimental to their health, and also to their duties as teachers. In some cases—in the case of my own school, for instance—the Board requires the same certificate from the first assistant as they require from the headmaster. The appointment I now hold was advertised, and applications were invited from teachers having D1, C2, or higher certificates, for the first-assistantship. For the headmastership of the same school, a few months previous, the Board advertised and invited applications from headmasters holding D1 or higher. I can quote another case: In the case of an appointment made recently to the Beresford Street School, for the first-assistantship the same certificate was required as in the case of the headmaster. Thus you will see that even the Board recognises that high qualifications are required from the first assistant. In some cases the first assistant has even a higher certificate than the headmaster, though, of course, the Board does not require that. In Auckland a first assistant has to be prepared at a moment's notice to take up the work of the headmaster during his temporary absence, and there are very few assistants in this district who have not at some time or other had to do this. I am now acting as temporary headmaster of the Wellesley Street School during the absence of Mr. Stewart on this Commission.

Then, again, the first assistant has to assist the headmaster in the tuition of pupil-teachers. The first assistant has also to take up and supervise the discipline of boys out of school If there is anything in the shape of a cadet corps he is called upon to go to work in connection with it; he has also to assist in athletics, or, at any rate, he looks upon such things as his duty. With regard to drill, several of our assistant masters have commissions as officers in Volunteer companies, and now this craze for cadet corps is on, the assistant masters will have to qualify for the rank of sergeant. We feel, if the salaries were made higher for the assistant masters, the effect would be to induce successful country teachers to come into the town schools in order to take up these positions, and that they would be looked upon as permanencies, rather than as stepping-stones. At the present time these positions, as you can imagine, carrying such low salaries, are looked upon now simply as stepping-stones for something higher. Assistant masters at present are not satisfied with their positions, simply because they see they have no hope of getting better appointments elsewhere. If a better state of things came about, which would give them added security, they would be content with their positions, and do better work in them, knowing that they had something to look forward to. In conclusion, I might say that the first assistants, and, indeed, other assistants, here are strongly in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries.

630. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Your present salary is £200, according to the report of the Education Department, is it not?—It is down to £190 at present.

631. The attendance at your school is over 700?—No, it is not over 700.

632. Are you aware that in the Union Street School, in Dunedin, with an average attendance of 200 pupils less, the first assistant master receives a salary of £240?—Yes, I noticed that.

633. The salaries in other schools range from 10 to 20 per cent. higher?—Yes.

634. If a colonial scale of salaries is established, and the capitation grant of £4 is not sufficient for a colonial basis of equal payment—that is, if it is not enough to work up to the highest standard—do you wish to see those teachers who are now paid reasonably high salaries pulled down in order to provide for those receiving lesser salaries?—No.

635. You say that distinctly?—Yes.

636. You want to see this scale approximating the highest standard of payments in New Zealand?—Yes.

637. You do not wish to see any of the salaries brought down?—No, I do not.

638. With regard to the staffing, would you prefer to teach a smaller number of pupils and receive a lower salary, or a larger number of pupils and a higher salary? Take 40, for instance?—I should prefer to teach 40 at the low salary that is paid rather than take a lesser number at a corresponding decreased salary.

639. If you had charge of 40 unaided, would you consider that the children received justice?—Yes; I should consider they would be efficiently taught.

640. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—I have been teaching fifteen years. I had one year in the Auckland Training-college, and four years in country service. I was second assistant for about one year, and have been first assistant eight years.

641. You did not serve an apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher?—No.

642. You stated you have had experience as a country teacher?—Yes.

643. You notice that under the alternative scale assistance is granted a sole teacher when the average attendance reaches 40?—Yes.

644. In your opinion, what form should that first assistance take?—A first-rate third-year female pupil-teacher.

645. A headmaster would, I assume, have to instruct that pupil-teacher in the art of teaching, and prepare her for examinations?—Yes.

646. That would entail a considerable amount of work on the headmaster?—Yes.

647. Do you think it would not be better to adopt the suggested scale, and appoint an infant mistress, as she is called, to take charge of Standards I. or II. and the infants when the average attendance reaches 40?—Yes, if it could be arranged.

648. Do you think it better to appoint an assistant mistress in that grade of school rather than a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

649. Do you think a sole teacher can efficiently manage and teach up to an attendance of 40?—Yes.

650. *Mr. Stewart.*] You know the assistant masters of this district?—Yes.

651. Are they satisfied with the present state of affairs?—No.

652. They feel they have no security?—Yes, no security whatever.

653. You received your appointment at a given salary: what was the salary?—£200.

654. Were the terms of your appointment in writing?—Yes.

655. Those terms have not been kept?—No; about two years ago I was reduced to £190.

656. There was no stipulation as to that in the terms of your engagement?—No.

657. Have you any legal remedy on that point?—I understand I have, but I do not like to apply a legal remedy.

658. You want the Commission to understand that your position is so insecure that, though you had a written engagement, it was not adhered to, and the terms of it were broken?—Yes, in my case.

659. With regard to assistants generally, have you ever heard any one of them say he or she was not desirous of the adoption of a colonial scale?—Not one; they are all strongly in favour of it.

660. Did you ever hold any position that brought you into contact with a large number of country teachers?—Yes; I was for some time secretary of the Educational Institute here, and in that capacity met a great many teachers.

661. What is the membership of the Auckland Branch at the present time?—300 or over.

662. Have you any doubt as to the position taken up by the vast majority of teachers in this district?—No doubt whatever.

663. You have spoken about the anomalies of the appointments of assistants: do you think, if a fair average rate of pay was fixed by the Commission, that the assistants in Auckland would be prepared to accept the findings of the Commission?—Yes, I think so.

664. Are there many female teachers in the school in which at present you are employed?—Eight lady assistants.

665. You know other female assistants throughout the Auckland District?—Yes, a good many.

666. Have they expressed an opinion to the Institute as to the advisability or otherwise of the adoption of a colonial scale?—Yes; not only to the Institute, but to myself personally, they have expressed a desire for a colonial scale most emphatically.

667. *Mr. Luke.*] When you were appointed first assistant of the Wellesley Street School, was the average attendance over 700?—No; below 700. This scale, which is supposed at present to obtain at Auckland, would entitle the first assistant to a salary of £200, but the two quarters previous to my taking up the position the average attendance was below 700.

668. What amount of bonus did you get from the Government?—£7 10s. for the quarter ending March.

669. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the staffing that obtains in Otago in schools of the size of the Wellesley Street School with the staffing in that school?—I have not compared it; I have simply looked at the salaries.

670. Do you not consider that the Auckland schools are overstaffed?—I do not consider that the Wellesley Street School is overstaffed, or the Nelson Street School.

671. I suppose you recognise the fact that when the staffing is so much more liberal the natural consequence is that the rate of pay cannot be as liberal?—Yes, distinctly. Of course, we have many small country schools, and that is why the town-school teachers are paid on such a low scale.

672. Do you consider a teacher unaided in a country school, with all standards, can efficiently teach up to 45 of an average attendance?—I think 45 too high; I should say 40.

673. You would not infer that the teaching in Southland is inefficient where a sole teacher teaches up to 45 with all standards?—No, I would not.

674. You think it stands to reason that where the assistance is not so liberal as in Auckland they can afford to pay higher salaries?—Yes.

675. In fact, I suppose, in regard to the Auckland scale, the teachers do not exactly know what scale they are being paid under?—The first assistants recognise they are being paid under a certain scale, but I do not think the lady assistants know exactly.

676. Is it not very often a matter of contract between the teachers and the Education Board as to what the Board will pay the teachers, and as to what they in return can get from the teachers?—The Board has to pay according to the scale.

677. *Mr. Hill.*] How many pupils have you in the standard class you now teach?—There are 56 on the roll; the average is 50 or 51.

678. Is that a higher average than you have been accustomed to teach?—No; previously I had charge of the Fifth Standard, and I started the year with 120 pupils, boys and girls; then I was assisted, now I am not.

679. Do you think a standard class like yours, with an average of 50 pupils, is easier to teach than a small school with an average attendance of 40 or 45 and all standards?—No, I do not.

680. You think your standard class is harder to teach, and that it requires more skill?—Yes, in the handling of children.

681. Supposing you, with your skill, were transferred to a small school of 45, such as I mentioned, do you think you could manage it?—Yes; I consider, more efficiently than my present standard.

682. You think 40 should be the maximum number for a sole teacher in a country school?—Yes, I think 40 quite high enough.

683. Do you think a female teacher could manage a school with an average attendance of 30?—Yes.

684. Do you think it would be advisable, in the interests of education, to put a female teacher in charge of such a school, or in charge of a school with an attendance below 30?—Yes; female teachers manage that class of schools very efficiently.

685. You think a well-trained male teacher could manage a school with an attendance between 40 and 45 successfully?—Yes.

686. If you were needing assistance, what form would you prefer it to take, a pupil-teacher or a junior assistant?—I should much prefer a junior assistant; but, failing that, a third-year pupil-teacher.

687. You mean by a third-year pupil-teacher one who has had some experience in school-work?—Yes.

688. You think that an early training in the case of those who are going to become teachers is desirable?—Yes, most decidedly.

689. Do you think they should be trained before taking up work in the schools?—If possible; but, of course, the best training is the practical training received in the school under the proper supervision of an efficient teacher.

690. Do you think it is desirable to take a young person from the Sixth Standard and put that young person to teach in a school without having had previous training?—No, it is not desirable.

691. You think that young persons should have proper training, or, rather, previous training in technical work under an efficient and skilled teacher?—Yes, it would be a decided advantage.

692. You think such a plan would be beneficial in the interests of education?—Yes, I am sure of it.

693. Will you suggest what you think a fair salary to pay to a first assistant in a school like yours?—£240 or £250.

694. Have you made any comparison as to the cost of living in the various towns?—I have had experience in the cost of living simply through travelling round.

695. I am told this is a specially cheap city to live in: is that so?—Not being a married man, I cannot say definitely.

696. You cannot express an opinion as to whether Auckland is a cheaper town to live in than, say, Napier or Nelson?—In the matter of house-rent I may say that Auckland is very much cheaper compared with Wellington.

697. Suppose there was a generalised scale adopted, I assume a master getting £250 here would be better off relatively than a master receiving the same salary—*i.e.*, £250—in Wellington?—Yes, to some extent.

698. Would you suggest that a differentiated scale should obtain?—No, I would not differentiate the scale; I think the cost of house-rent in Wellington is compensated by the cheapness of other necessaries of life; I understand groceries and household necessities are cheaper in Wellington than in Auckland.

699. Do you think a good plan would be that a first assistant master in a large town school should receive the same salary as the headmaster in a certain class of school—say, a third-, fourth-, or fifth-class school?—I think the principle is a good one; but I would not rate the assistant's status so low. In Auckland, for instance, we do not know our status compared with the headmasters of schools. First assistants cannot get their names submitted for positions in fairly good schools in the Auckland District. We do not know why, and we would like to know our status.

700. Assume all the schools were placed in ten classes, would you approve of the first assistants in the highest class of school being equal to the headmasters in the eighth-class of school—that is, next to the top but two?—Yes.

701. You are of opinion that the first assistant is as qualified to conduct a school as is the headmaster?—Yes.

702. Do you find from your experience that the assistant mistresses are well qualified to teach the upper standard classes?—No, I do not think so. For instance, infant mistresses, I think, would be lost as standard mistresses.

703. Would not that remark apply to assistant masters? Could an assistant master take any standard?—Yes; he would be well qualified.

704. Do you not think that adaptation takes place in a great many cases?—I do not think that contention holds so much in the case of men.

705. Is there no distinction in the training of the various standards?—I do not think so, not a great deal.

706. Supposing the headmaster of your school required you to take Standard II., would you object?—I would not object, of course, to what the headmaster thought fit, but I should consider my talent would be wasted. Of course, I consider I am equally qualified to teach Standard II. as Standard VI.

707. You are of opinion that the headmaster has the right to place you or any assistant in such a position as he may think fit?—Yes.

708. Supposing he had a specially qualified mistress, do you think he would be entitled to put her in charge of Standard VI. if he thought fit?—He would be entitled to do anything he pleased.

709. Supposing she performed the duties in as satisfactory manner as the assistant master, would you suggest she should receive less remuneration?—No.

710. You think she should receive the same remuneration as the assistant master?—I would hardly go so far as that. The question of supply and demand comes in. In the case of an assistant mistress and an assistant master the latter has a higher status in the school.

711. Assume that a female assistant does the same work as the assistant master, say, in connection with Standard IV., should she not receive the same salary?—As close to it as possible; there should not be a great difference.

712. *Mr. Weston.*] What are your complaints in respect to the present methods of payments?—My complaint is that we have no feeling of security.

713. Is that the only ground of complaint?—I do not see why we should be paid on a lower scale than other districts, notably in the South.

714. Would not that difficulty, in your opinion, be removed if the Board's allowance was increased?—No, I do not think so.

715. Why not?—Because our experience in the past does not justify me in saying so. We do not know how the Board will allocate the money.

716. You have no confidence whatever in the Boards of Education?—I have very little.

717. You think the Board exercises its power arbitrarily, and therefore you are all dissatisfied?—Thoroughly dissatisfied.

718. I understood you to say that you had no chance of promotion—that in connection with appointments for higher positions your name and other names were not sent up?—That is so.

719. Do you think a colonial scale of staff and salaries would improve your position in that respect?—I should conclude so; that it would embrace a colonial scale of promotion.

720. Then, you advocate a colonial scale of staff and salaries because you think a colonial scale of promotion would be inevitable?—Yes; I think one would be in corelation to the other.

721. If there was no scale of promotion, would you disapprove of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—No.

722. Do you mean, if there is a scale of promotion, that if you filled a certain position, and there was a vacancy that had to be filled from that position, you would get the appointment irrespective of your qualifications?—No, I do not mean that.

723. Then, what would be the use of a scale of promotion; your particular status would count for little?—I would depend upon my qualifications; I suppose the scale would be based on qualifications.

724. Do you mean to say that with a scale of promotion the Boards of Education would be debarred from taking the special circumstances into consideration?—No.

725. You do not think that would very materially discount the value of your ideal system of promotion?—I do not think so.

726. You said you thought a colonial scale would naturally operate all over the colony?—I think it would.

727. Do not the circumstances of each provincial and educational district differ?—I do not think they differ to a very great extent.

728. Do they differ at all?—Yes.

729. In what respect?—I think in some of the poorest-paid districts the anomaly is that the cost of living is higher than in other districts.

730. You do not think, such being the case, that the Boards of Education should have latitude to increase or decrease salaries?—I do not think they would take the opportunity of using any latitude.

731. Do you speak from your own experience as it is confined to the Auckland Education District, or from experience obtained throughout the colonies?—My experience of the Auckland Education District.

732. What experience have you had in other districts?—I have had no teaching experience at all; the experience is from what I have read.

733. Do you not think, those circumstances should be taken into account?—I do not see how they can be; I think it would complicate matters.

734. Do you think that, if the circumstances of each district are to be lost sight of, a colonial scale would operate fair and equitably to all teachers of the colony: assume the circumstances to be different, because you have admitted to some extent they are?—I do not think the circumstances are so very different, and I think the colonial scale would be fairer, because the Boards of Education do not recognise the cost of living in different districts.

735. You speak of the conduct of the Board in Auckland, knowledge gained from your experience?—I am taking the cost of living in Auckland as compared with other districts, and I find the teachers in the districts where the cost of living is higher are worse paid than in districts where the cost of living is not so high.

736. With regard to female teachers in small schools, do you or do you not consider females are better adapted for teaching in our small schools than males?—No, I do not. I consider a female teacher can efficiently teach a small school, but I do not consider she is better adapted to do so than a male.

737. Do you not think that in the small country schools, where the children may be young and not so well favoured as children in the large centres, that a woman would not be able to sympathize with and impart instruction to the children better than a man?—She would do very well, but not better than a man.

738. I suppose a small country school with all standards is rather difficult to teach?—I have taught such a school myself, and found no difficulty.

739. I do not mean to say that it would be difficult to impart instruction to the children; but would not the numerous classes be difficult for a sole teacher to undertake?—No.

740. If a sole-teacher school in a country district be not difficult, then how many children could such a teacher in that class of school fairly take?—About an average of 40 for a male.

741. You think justice would be done?—Yes.

742. You would not go up to 45?—Yes, you might go up to 45; but I think it is a little too far; I think 40 better.

743. In your opinion, what should be the minimum salary paid to teachers under your Board?—£80 a year.

744. For male and female alike, or would you make a difference between them?—No, no difference; I think £80 a year quite little enough.

745. What sized school, in your opinion, should carry a salary of £80 a year?—Schools of an average attendance of 15 and under 20.

746. Do we understand you to say that £80 should be a sufficient salary for a school of an average attendance of 20?—No, I should not say 20; say an average of 15 or 16.

747. In regard to pupil-teacher teaching, do you think it is effective?—Under proper supervision a first-year pupil-teacher can take certain subjects, do correcting-work, and so on, but could not manage large classes.

748. What do you think a first-, second-, and third-year pupil-teacher should be limited to in the work of a town school?—Such a pupil-teacher should be under an assistant, and assist that class-teacher in the matter of corrections and giving dictation.

749. In the town schools would there be a guarantee that the pupil-teacher's marking and instruction would be corrected by the assistant teacher over that pupil-teacher?—Yes.

750. Is there absolutely complete supervision?—There is.

751. Do you think it is advantageous to the children and to the pupil-teacher alike that the present system of keeping a pupil-teacher at work during the day should be continued?—Under the present system in Auckland a first-year pupil-teacher teaches four hours a day; that is fair. But the Board has another regulation, which says that the head-teacher shall instruct the pupil-teacher after hours; that is very unfair indeed, both to the headmaster and the pupil-teacher.

752. Does that apply throughout the pupil-teacher's term?—Yes.
753. As a matter of fact, I presume that you are of the opinion that pupil-teacher teaching should be kept within narrow bounds?—Yes.
754. *Mr. Luke.*] You are in charge of the Wellesley Street School *pro tem.*?—Yes.
755. What extra assistance have you?—I have an assistant.
756. A relieving-teacher?—Yes, a relieving-teacher classified D2.
757. *Mr. Hogben.*] I understand that the two chief reasons you gave for supporting a colonial scale were the insecurity of the salaries and the inequality of the salaries paid in different districts at the present time?—Yes.
758. In examination by Mr. Weston you also mentioned the question of promotion of teachers?—Yes.
759. The insecurity, as I understand it, is the feeling of uncertainty as to what teachers' salaries will be for any given period in the future—what salary each individual teacher will be paid?—Yes.
760. The inequality connotes the fact that a teacher in one district doing the same work as a teacher in another district is paid a less salary?—Yes.
761. Are not those questions quite distinct from the question of promotion?—Yes.
762. If those questions were got rid of, you would be rid of two out of three of your objections?—Yes.
763. They would be got rid of without touching the question of promotion?—Yes.
764. It is not inevitable that a promotion scheme should be attached to a colonial scale?—No, it is not bound to follow.
765. With regard to the certificates, a certificate consists of two parts—the letter and the figure—does it not?—Yes.
766. The figure includes two elements?—Yes; length of service and efficiency.
767. Who gives the estimate of efficiency?—The Chief Inspector.
768. So that the certificate, if properly awarded, should include such an estimate of efficiency as the Boards would take into account?—Yes.
769. You are not aware that the Inspectors, in giving that estimate, exclude any of the qualifications that make an efficient teacher?—I think most of them look more at the results.
770. In your opinion, they should be allowed to take everything into account except moral influence and qualifications?—Yes.
771. You do not know of any way in which you could classify moral qualifications?—No.
772. All the qualifications it would be possible to classify you would expect to find in a certificate?—Yes.
773. *Mr. Weston.*] A man's aptitude for a particular position, whether he would be adapted to town or country life, would be taken into consideration by Boards when filling a particular vacancy?—Yes; I think those particular considerations should be taken into account.
774. *Mr. Hogben.*] That would be an argument in favour of local appointment of teachers, would it not?—Yes, provided those making the appointments could see the applicants. My opinion is that the Inspectors should have more to do with the appointment of teachers, as they meet the teachers and know what they are like.
775. The advice of the Inspectors would be valuable to the Boards?—Yes.
776. You say that the circumstances differ in different districts, and you stated that you thought that notwithstanding a colonial scale of payment was fairer than the existing scales?—Yes.
777. Are you aware that it is stated that in Westland the cost of living is somewhat higher than it is in Auckland or Canterbury?—Yes.
778. Some of those districts are the most prosperous?—Yes.
779. I presume there are out-of-the-way districts in the Auckland Provincial District where the cost of living is high?—Yes.
780. Have you compared the salaries paid on the West Coast and in these other out-of-the-way places with the salaries paid in Otago and Canterbury?—Yes.
781. Are the Boards able to pay higher salaries in Westland and these other out-of-the-way places than in Otago?—They do not do it.
782. Is not the cost of small schools very much greater per head than the cost of large schools?—Yes, very much; I know of one case where the cost is £6 or £7 per head.
783. Is the number of small schools in Auckland, compared with the number of small schools in other districts, large?—Yes.
784. Suppose the Auckland Board received an increased capitation grant, would they be able to pay as high salaries?—No, they would not be in a position to do it.
785. Then, merely an increased capitation grant would not enable the Boards to pay equal salaries all over the colony?—No.
786. Such reasons would lead you to be in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.
787. You say you were appointed in writing by the Auckland Education Board at a salary of £200 a year?—Yes.
788. Was that not on the understanding that your salary would fall in accordance with the scale of the Board?—It did not say so.
789. Do you not enter the service of the Board subject to the Board's regulations?—Yes.
790. Is that scale not one of the Board's regulations?—No; it was not in force then; it was latent or lying dormant.
791. Have you any reason to suppose that the Board's scale was latent?—It was understood so.
792. By whom?—By all.

793. And the Board passed a resolution rescinding it?—No; but it was looked upon as a dead-letter by assistants.

794. *The Chairman.*] I suppose the reason you favour a colonial scale is because you wish to see the salaries on a uniform basis throughout the colony?—Yes.

795. Have you resided in other parts of the colony?—No, I have not.

796. You are aware that the cost of living is very different in one part of the colony from that in another?—Yes.

797. And that it sometimes varies in the same district?—Yes.

798. In such cases does the Board make any difference in the payment of salaries?—None whatever.

799. If the salaries were made uniform, do you think there would be any danger of the best class of teachers gravitating from places where the cost of living is high to places where the cost of living is comparatively low—where rents are low and where the necessaries of life are cheaper?—There might be a tendency that way, but I think it would be controlled by the department making appointments.

800. It is not proposed that the department should make the appointments: what do you mean by that statement?—I mean the Boards making the appointments.

801. You think it would be impossible, then, for the Boards to make appointments to rectify that difficulty, and you think the difficulty would still remain?—Yes.

802. I would like to ascertain from you definitely if you do not think, in all probability, if salaries were paid on a uniform basis throughout New Zealand, the best class of teachers would gravitate to the districts where they could live at the least expense?—Yes.

803. Do you not think the cost of living has a great deal to do with the determination of people as to where they shall reside?—No; I think the matter of climate affects them more than the question of cost of living.

804. Has the Board here altered its scale of salaries very frequently?—There was no assistant masters' scale until a few years ago.

805. I understood you to say that the Board does not pay sufficient attention to the recommendations of Inspectors?—It is a private opinion. I say that I consider Inspectors should have more to do in the matter of appointments of teachers.

806. Does not the Board consult the Inspectors when making appointments?—I have heard it does not.

807. It is only a matter of hearsay?—Yes.

808. Do you know what process is adopted by other Boards?—No.

809. You speak of the Board with which you are acquainted?—Yes.

810. With regard to the work of an assistant master in a large town school, a class master, and the work of a sole teacher in a moderate-sized county school, do you think there is a considerable difference?—I think the work of the assistant master in a town school is more arduous than the work of a master in a country school. I know the headmasters of moderate-sized country schools can get away punctually when the school closes, but assistant masters in town schools have very often to stop on until 5 o'clock correcting work, and at the same time very often have to take work home.

811. You have been in charge of a country school?—Yes, with an average attendance of about 30.

812. Did you teach all the standards?—Yes, up to and including the Sixth Standard.

813. Then, you have a good idea of the work to be performed by a sole male teacher in that class of school?—Yes.

814. If you had the choice of a country school with an average attendance of 30 children against the present position you are occupying, and the salary was the same in each case, which position would you prefer, after weighing everything in the balance, such as the social advantages, &c., to be gained in town?—For some reasons I should prefer my present position, and for other reasons I would prefer the country appointment.

815. I want your decided answer as to which appointment you would choose, all things being equal in the matter of salary?—I believe I would take the country school.

816. Is your salary much more now than you would be receiving in charge of such a country school?—Yes; I think the salary in a country school of that size would be about £160.

817. I presume, in that case, country teachers would prefer to become assistants in the town?—I presume so.

818. You think that, the duties of a teacher of a moderate-sized school being less arduous than the duties of a town assistant in a large school, he should not be entitled to the same salary?—I do not think the sole teacher of a school of an average attendance of 40 is entitled to the same salary as an assistant in a school with an average attendance of 600.

819. Then, what is likely to be the effect in the country if there is a difference in the salaries: do you think the country will get the same quality of teachers as the town? Is it not natural—is it not inevitable—that if town assistants receive larger salaries the best class of country teachers will flock to positions in the towns?—Yes.

820. In the interests of the country families, is it not desirable that the salaries of the country teachers should be raised to the level of those paid to assistants in town?—Yes; I would like to see my own raised too. I might point out that the country teachers get a house.

821. If you had a house would you still be of opinion, if you had the choice of the two positions I put to you, that the country position would be the best of the two?—I say the salary would be just as good.

822. The salary being as good, do you think that the country situation is preferable to that of the assistant in town?—Yes.

823. You are decided on that point?—Yes.

824. Do you think the appointment of teachers should be left in the hands of Boards, or should be vested in the central department?—The Board of Education, acting for the Inspectors—that is—taking the Inspectors' opinions—are better qualified to make the appointments.

825. You say that the impression is that the Boards do not take the Inspectors' opinions?—That is the opinion.

826. Under those circumstances, do you think the teachers would be more satisfied to be under the hands of the central department than under the administration of the Boards, with reference to promotion and appointments?—Yes, that is the opinion.

827. You think it is a wide prevailing opinion among teachers?—Yes.

HUGH CAMPBELL examined.

Mr. Campbell: I have been asked to come here this morning and express my views on the general question. It appears to me there are three points which are of principal importance: First, that there should be equal pay for equal work; secondly, that there should be certainty of emolument; and, thirdly, that there should be sufficiency of emolument. With regard to equality of payment, I think on that depends the satisfaction with which those in the employ of the Education Board discharge their duties. If some are being treated better than others it naturally tends to create a feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction. With regard to certainty of emolument, I mean that there should be a fixed scale for young men entering upon the pursuit of teaching as their calling in life; that they should have before them fairly defined ideas of what their prospects are. As to sufficiency of emolument, it should be sufficient not only to maintain them in the teaching profession, but to keep up that method of life and social standing which the pursuit of education involves. It appears to me that the pursuit of every profession largely depends upon the position which may be attained by the best young men entering the profession; and, in regard to the teaching profession, unless you offer suitable inducements to young men to enter upon, and not only enter upon but to continue in the profession, the teaching profession will be degraded below that high rank which it is entitled to hold. I myself hold very strongly that the teaching profession is one of the most noble of all professions. Of course, it is impossible that every teacher in the profession should have a high salary; but I take it there ought to be a certain proportion of positions in the profession to which ambitious men may attain. It is not necessary that there should be a very large proportion of them, because in every walk of life there is only a small proportion who attain to what are called the prizes of the profession. I think it is as important that the teaching profession should offer sufficient number of prizes as any other profession. I have not had time to go into the details of salaries.

828. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You say "equal pay for equal work": do you mean that if a female teacher—and we had the case of Miss Shrewsbury before us—takes the Seventh Standard, and performs the work as well as a male teacher would, you would pay her the same salary as you would allot to a male teacher?—No, I do not think so, for this reason: that I assume a female teacher does not have the responsibility of teaching boys.

829. But I am speaking of a mixed school where boys and girls are taught?—Then, in that case, I say she should receive the same salary.

830. You would apply that right throughout the service?—Yes.

831. If given precisely the same work?—Yes.

832. Would you make no difference whatever in payment to a married male teacher?—I do not think so.

833. With regard to sufficiency of emolument, I suppose you have not gone into the details of it?—No.

834. You have not considered the number of small schools, and how they should be handled?—No, I cannot say I have.

835. Have you considered the question of a minimum wage?—No.

836. Or the question of a superannuation scheme for teachers?—I do not believe in superannuation at all; I think the salaries should be adequate enough to allow teachers to provide for their old age.

837. If the £4 capitation grant which is suggested as the basis be not sufficient to give sufficiency of emolument to all, are you of opinion that the Government should be approached for a higher grant?—Undoubtedly.

838. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your experience in the administration of the Education Act?—Very little further than this.

839. Did you ever hold a position on a School Committee, or as member of an Education Board?—No.

840. You dealt with three heads—the quality of pay, certainty of emolument, and sufficiency of emolument?—Yes.

841. I interpreted your meaning on the first head to be that, instead of there being thirteen different scales of payment throughout the colony, there should be one uniform scale, and that a man occupying a certain grade or position in Otago should be paid at the same rate as a teacher holding a similar position in Auckland, or any other district?—Yes; I used the word "teacher." Whether it be a female or a male, I do not care.

842. You approve of a uniform scale of payment for the teachers of the colony?—I do, certainly.

843. Do you think that if the uniform colonial scale were brought into force by Act of Parliament it would insure a greater certainty of emolument than the present method of having thirteen different scales for the thirteen educational districts of the colony?—I certainly think a colonial scale very much preferable to the present piecemeal mode of payment.

844. Is it your opinion that at the present time the best class of boys are not entering the profession?—Yes; and I may say that the best class of young men do not stay in the teaching profession; if they can get out of it they do.

845. Why?—They measure their strength as they grow older, and they ascertain they would do better in another profession other than the teaching profession.

846. In your opinion, the salaries at the present time are inadequate?—Yes; I think the highest salaries at the present time are inadequate.

847. You are also of opinion that the present inadequacy of payment is not only causing the best class of boys not to enter the profession, but also is causing dissatisfaction and unrest among those already in the profession?—I believe that to be the tendency, but I cannot answer positively.

848. *Mr. Luke.*] Have you any experience of the boys that have left the public schools in Auckland, and have passed through your office?—Yes, a good number of boys have passed through my hands.

849. Do you think, on the whole, they have received the foundation of a pretty good education in the public schools in Auckland?—Yes; the boys who have come into my office from the Grammar School have shown much more rapid advancement in the matter of their studies than the boys from the public schools; the Grammar School boys pass their examinations in a shorter time, I have noticed.

850. Would not some of the lads you speak of have been in the public schools first, and have won district scholarships, thus graduating from the public schools to the Grammar School?—I do not think so.

851. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider that the average age of the teachers in the Auckland District is increasing?—My acquaintance among the teachers is not extensive.

852. Would you favour a superannuation scheme or retiring-allowance among teachers who have grown old in the service?—No, for the reasons I stated before.

853. I think you will admit that the salaries being paid to the teachers at the present time precludes them making any provision for their old age?—Yes; I think it is impossible for them to make any provision unless they live in a manner which most of us would not like to live in.

854. *Mr. Hill.*] You are aware that the cost of living varies very materially in different districts?—I do not think it does.

855. You think a man in Nelson or Hokitika, for example, could live as cheaply as in Auckland?—Yes, I do, for I have lived in Nelson.

856. *Mr. Weston.*] You have simply given expression to what you consider to be the ethical side of the question?—Yes, entirely.

857. You are unable to give me any information in regard to the incidental expenses of schools here?—I cannot furnish that information.

858. You stated just now that boys from the State schools passed through your office, and that they were not altogether of equal attainment with the boys from the high schools?—Yes.

859. Do you think the introduction of what is called technical education, and a consequent removal from the present syllabus of some of the subjects, would intensify that difference?—I do not think it would. It would depend on the course of education in the schools. I think there are some subjects which are comparatively useless, and to which a great deal of time is given.

860. What subjects do you particularly allude to?—I think, seeing the papers shown to me by my young friends, that English grammar and geography are subjects to which a great deal of time is unnecessarily given. My opinion is that there is no English grammar at all; it is not a subject that can be taught systematically, like, for instance, the grammar of Greek or Latin.

861. If, on the other hand, the boys in the secondary schools are better qualified, would it not follow that the elimination of the subjects from the syllabus of the primary schools, and confining the education to reading, writing, and arithmetic, would intensify the evil that you referred to?—I think not. I think you want to teach the children habits of thinking rather than to "stuff" them with a great many facts which are practically of no use to them, and facts which can be acquired at any moment by turning up a dictionary or encyclopedia.

862. Then, in what consists the value of sending boys to the grammar schools instead of to the primary schools?—I think a boy should be well grounded in English literature and history; I am not in favour of foreign languages being studied in this colony at all. If a boy is well taught in mathematics, when he enters upon the work of life, no matter what profession he follows, he is far more likely to make progress than if "stuffed" with educational facts.

863. *The Chairman.*] You consider that teachers who occupy positions at the head of the profession are not sufficiently remunerated?—Yes.

864. You think it would help our system of primary education if the prizes of the profession were better than they are now?—Yes, I think so. I think the best way would be, if possible, to let the primary merge into the secondary, so that the teachers who are to commence in the primary schools will have an opportunity of taking positions in the secondary schools.

865. Do you consider it desirable, in order that our schools should be efficiently worked, that a maximum attendance should be fixed for the size of schools?—I think it is almost impossible for you to say how many children can be efficiently taught in one school, under one master, with the assistance of assistant masters.

866. You would be in favour of letting the city schools grow to any size circumstances may permit?—I have no opinion by which I can come to any conclusion.

867. With regard to the prizes of the profession, you said you did not think they should be so numerous?—Yes; they are not numerous in any walk of life.

868. Do you not think the prizes in the teaching profession at the present time are good?—I understand that the highest salary in the Auckland Education District is £350; I do not think that is a prize at all.

869. Do you consider that men should require huge salaries for teaching in primary schools?—I do not think that men with huge salaries are required for teaching infant-schools; but I am of the opinion that there should be positions to which a man can look forward to, and for which he can show his fitness to discharge the highest functions.

870. Then, if prizes were established, do you think that the holders should have a vested interest for life in those prizes?—No.

871. How would you remove them and make room for others?—I do not think it is a matter of difficulty; it is a matter of detail to which I have not devoted my attention.

872. Do you think it would help an ambitious and talented teacher to see other teachers enjoying salaries which he could not hope to secure?—No; but I do not think that is so.

873. Would you periodically change those high positions?—I certainly would not; I do not think it is good for the country that teachers should be changed too often.

874. You would not prescribe an age-limit at which teachers should retire from the service?—No; I think such a proposal is the greatest rubbish.

875. You do not think that teachers at the age of sixty or sixty-five are incapable of following their profession?—No, I do not; of course, some men may be—it depends on the individual.

876. For the same class of work you say you would not differentiate the salaries between married male teachers and single female teachers?—No; probably I would give preference to the married men.

877. Would you give preference to a bachelor over a female teacher?—I do not see reason for preference in a case of that sort.

878. With regard to young people that you have had acquaintance with, was it owing to their superior education that you found them better students and more successful in life?—Yes, I think so.

879. That would indicate that we might give superior education in our primary schools?—Yes; I think that in the primary schools education is not given as it should be, or is not as useful as it should be. As I indicated, I think some subjects should be dropped and others taken up.

880. You would prefer to see the children taught habits of study?—Yes; habits of thinking and reasoning.

881. Are you in favour of having our system of secondary education so grafted on to primary education that the children of the people, poor and wealthy alike, should have equal opportunities?—Yes; I do not mean to say that every boy and girl should have a high education, but that they should have equal chances.

W. M. McIntosh, Headmaster of the Onehunga School, examined.

Mr. McIntosh: I am in favour of a colonial scale: (*a*) We will get equal pay for equal work; (*b*) our rate of pay will be more secure, and not subject to alteration, as at present. I do not approve altogether of the proposed colonial scale, or of the alternative scale. The full scale reduces the salaries of all headmasters in charge of schools having an average of over 300 pupils. As the school increases in size the reduction in salary is greater or more marked. As an example of this, a school with an average of 390 is worth, under the Auckland Board's original scale, £311. By the suggested scale it is worth £295, a reduction of £16. A school of 450 is worth £330; by the suggested scale it is worth £307, a reduction of £23. A school of 750 is worth £420; by the suggested scale £361, a reduction of £59. When the extra grant was given, which is now paid as a bonus, it was intended by the Government that it should be used for the reinstatement of those salaries reduced by the respective Boards, and to increase the salaries of underpaid teachers. Another objection is the fact that a school with an average of 200 is worth £252, whilst a school of 450 is worth only £307. This means that a master of the latter class of school is responsible for the education of 250 more children than that of the former, at an increased remuneration of £55 only. I object to the increased staff as set forth in the colonial scheme if it means that it entails a reduction in salaries. In the alternative scale of staff the staffing compares favourably with the present staffing of the Auckland schools. I give some examples. In a school with an average of 61 to 90 the staff is the same, one assistant; in a school of 90 to 120 the same, one assistant and one pupil-teacher; in a school of 150 the same, one assistant and two pupil-teachers. In a school of 156 to 200 there are two assistants and two pupil-teachers, which is the same as in the suggested scale. In a school of 201 to 240 there are two assistants and three pupil-teachers, whereas in the proposed scale there are three assistants and two pupil-teachers, the assistant being in place of a pupil-teacher, which is a gain. In a school of 241 to 285 there are three assistants and three pupil-teachers, the same as in the proposed scale. In a school of 286 to 325 there are three assistants and four pupil-teachers, whereas in the suggested scale there are four assistants and three pupil-teachers, being a gain for an assistant for a pupil-teacher. I have been in charge of four or five different grades of schools having averages from 30 to 460, and during that time have had no complaints from my staff as to their inability to cope with the work. With few exceptions, I do not approve of female teachers receiving the same salaries as males for the same work; but I consider 20 per cent. less than the salaries paid to males too great a reduction, for the following reasons: They have not the responsibilities of men. As a rule, they cannot control upper-standard boys in large classes. They cannot stand the strain and worry of teaching as well as a male. They do not, as a rule, make a life occupation of teaching. With regard to the teaching of pupil-teachers, teachers under the Auckland Board are required to train and instruct their pupil-teachers out of school-hours without remuneration. I consider the system of the training and the employment of pupil-teachers a bad one. In reference to the payment for average attendance, the present system of payment of salaries is obviously unfair. Instead of allowing all attendances on half-days when the attendance is less than half the roll-number not to count in the average attendance, it would be much more equitable to allow a deduction of two-thirds or three-fourths of

the roll-number. It would be better still to take the highest attendance on any one day during the quarter. In my school on only five days in four years has the attendance been less than half the roll-number. I consider most of our assistant teachers are underpaid, also a number of teachers of small schools. In my opinion, first male assistants should get a salary equal to three-fifths of the salary paid to the headmaster. Thus, in a school worth £300 a year the first assistant would get £180; the second male assistant would get a salary equal to two-thirds of the salary paid to the first assistant, £120. In conclusion, in no other service in the colony have the salaries of old servants in the higher positions been reduced to add to the salaries of those who have been but a short time employed. Mr. Justice Cooper, in his evidence before the Commission, said that the teaching profession was the most important and responsible in the State, and that it should be upheld by getting the best teachers and paying them salaries that would encourage the most suitable young people to enter the profession. I certainly think the social status of teachers should be upheld by paying them salaries in keeping with the position. It would never do to go back to the days of Goldsmith's village schoolmaster. With reference to pensions to teachers, I consider there should be a pension scheme—2½ per cent., 5 per cent., and 7 per cent. off salaries. I believe our Board has some form of retiring-allowance for teachers; but there is one provision in this retiring-allowance which, in my opinion, spoils it, and that is that before a teacher could claim the allowance he would have to prove to the Board that he was practically without means of living. This encourages teachers to be thriftless. I might just show a comparison of the salaries of headmasters and first assistants. A headmaster in Auckland with an average of 450 receives £308; in Otago with an average of 424 he receives £364 11s. 3d.; in Port Chalmers with an average of 451 the headmaster receives £305; in North Canterbury with an average of 402 he receives £330; and in Hawke's Bay with an average of 482 £347 17s. A first assistant with an average of 450, in Auckland receives £150, in Otago £242, in Port Chalmers £220, in North Canterbury £165, and in Hawke's Bay £235 1s. House-rent should be added to the salaries. Teachers could then pay rent for the houses of the Board, or for others if the Board had not built one in the district. Teachers could then get houses to suit them. With reference to teachers' certificates, there should be a first grade and a second grade. I do not approve of bonuses on certificates. Committees choose D1 men. I have been asked by a country teacher to say that when he was in charge of two half-time schools he was allowed £20 a year extra for teaching on Saturdays; but when his salary reached £150 the £20 was not allowed. He also wished me to say that he paid house-rent for seven years and a half on a salary of £150.

882. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I understand you wish to see our better class of salaries maintained throughout the colony?—Yes.

883. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—I have been teaching for twenty years. I taught in a country school with an average attendance of about 35, and I taught a school at Epsom with an average attendance of 75, and which afterwards increased to 200.

884. You have noticed the proposed alternative scale?—Yes.

885. With regard to the staffing, do you approve of the first assistance to a sole teacher in a school of an attendance of 40 taking the form of a mistress?—I do not think it is necessary. I think such staffing is too liberal for a school of from 40 to 45 in attendance.

886. What staffing, then, would you suggest?—An ex-pupil-teacher with a certificate, or a junior assistant; if the scale would not allow that, a second- or third-year pupil-teacher.

887. You would prefer the term "junior assistant"?—Yes.

888. What salary would you suggest she would receive?—Well, at the present time I have a pupil-teacher whom I am about to lose. She is going into the country shortly, and I asked her what she would consider a fair salary to receive, and after consideration she said £60 a year.

889. Do you think a woman who has spent perhaps five years or more in hard study, and in preparing herself for the duties of a teacher, who has completed her course and obtained her certificate, and who goes into the country, probably away from home, having to provide herself with board and lodgings, and to keep up the appearance her position demands, is adequately paid by a salary of £60 a year?—Well, I should say £60 or £70 a year; I am not particular to £10.

890. In your opinion, the suggested salary of £90 is too high?—Yes; I think £70, at the outside, is sufficient.

891. What is the highest average attendance you think a sole teacher can efficiently manage in a school with all standards?—I should say the average competent male teacher could manage 45, though it would mean night-work as well.

892. Forty-five would be the limit?—Yes.

893. Do you not think that is somewhat too high?—No. Speaking from my own experience, the last country school I had I taught up to the Sixth Standard with three primer classes, and the average attendance was 36.

894. What is the average attendance in your school at present?—About 470; for the last quarter, 460.

895. Your school is of that grade between 400 and 500?—Yes.

896. What is your salary?—£308. Of course, I had a bonus, which brought it up to £327.

897. I understood your salary was £330?—That was under the scale of 1896; at the present time my salary is £308.

898. What is the salary of your first assistant male teacher?—£150.

899. What is the salary of your infant mistress, or the lady assistant in charge of the infant department?—£95.

900. What is the salary of your second male assistant?—I have no second male assistant.

901. Are you satisfied with the staffing of your school?—Yes, except in regard to pupil-teachers.

902. Have you compared the salary you are at present receiving with the salaries paid to headmasters of schools of a similar size in Otago?—Yes.

903. In a school of from 450 to 500 in Otago what is the salary paid to the headmaster?—£305.

904. What would the first male assistant in such a school in Otago receive?—At the Port Chalmers School I think the first male assistant receives £220.

905. An increase of £70 over what is paid to your first assistant?—Yes.

906. Did you also notice that the infant mistress in such a school in Otago would receive a salary of £140?—No, I have not noticed that.

907. If a colonial scale would materially raise the salaries of assistants, both male and female, throughout the Auckland Education District, and at the same time only slightly reduce the salaries paid to headmasters, would you be in favour of its adoption?—I do not think it necessary to reduce any of the salaries of headmasters, and it seems to me to be going upon the principle of robbing Peter to pay Paul. Our Board reduced our salaries in order to increase the salaries of country teachers, and I maintain it should not have done that.

908. If the salaries of assistants and headmasters in Auckland were raised to the level obtaining in Otago, would you approve of that?—Yes, if it could be done with the increase of capitation of 5s. per head.

909. Do you think these changes would be less frequent under a colonial scale, seeing that you have had so many changes in the matter of different scales?—Certainly I do.

910. You would not object, though, if a slight reduction in the headmasters' salaries was compensated by the stability of the assistants' salaries?—I think all the salaries should be increased *pro ratâ*.

911. *Mr. Luke.*] You have studied the alternative scale?—Yes.

912. If the assistants' salaries in the Auckland Education District were raised to the highest level obtaining throughout the colony, you are of opinion that it would be a decided advantage?—Yes.

913. You think the assistants in the Onehunga School are not paid adequately?—I think they are wretchedly paid.

914. Have you a residence attached to the school?—Yes, I have a house and 2 acres of land; the house is only a six-roomed house with a scullery.

915. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How many assistants have you in your school?—Five.

916. How many of them are females?—Four.

917. How many pupil-teachers have you?—Five.

918. How many of them are females?—Four.

919. How do you account for the fact that the large preponderance of the teachers in the town schools in Auckland are females: is preference given to them by the Boards?—I do not think so. It is the question of cheapness. I do not think there is sufficient inducement for males to take up the teaching profession.

920. Do you consider that 10 per cent. is a sufficient difference in the salaries paid to male and female teachers?—Yes, I think 10 or 15 per cent.; 20 per cent., I think, is too high.

921. Do you consider that if female teachers were remunerated in the same manner as male teachers it would tend to a lesser number of female teachers being appointed?—I cannot say; in some instances there are female teachers far better than male teachers, but I think male teachers can stand the strain of teaching better than female teachers, as a rule. In this instance I might mention that I have two lady teachers in my school whom I would not change for any male teachers I know of.

922. Do you consider a female assistant can teach up to and including the Fourth Standard as efficiently as can a male teacher?—I think a number can, but the majority cannot. It is not want of ability on their part, but I think they cannot maintain the discipline.

923. *Mr. Hill.*] You instruct the pupil-teachers?—Yes.

924. Do you make any arrangement with the teachers of your staff to give you help?—Yes; the Board allows us to delegate some of the work to the assistants, and in that manner we divide the labour.

925. All the assistants?—Yes.

926. Do you make the assistants also responsible for their technical training, as well as their ordinary mental training?—No.

927. You place a pupil-teacher under an assistant teacher?—Yes, in the ordinary work of the school.

928. Has the assistant the right to require that pupil-teacher to prepare notes of lessons before an object-lesson is given in the school?—Yes.

929. You require and you supervise the notes kept to show that the work has been duly carried out?—Yes; and we have a rule that pupil-teachers have to give lessons on school method once a fortnight before me.

930. Are you the only teacher present, or are all the teachers on the staff present?—Only the class-teacher and myself.

931. Regarding house allowance: supposing you have a house in connection with your school, and you find it too small, would not your Board, on application, allow you to let that house and rent another?—There is no provision that I am aware of to that effect.

932. In the matter of certificates, you think a B1 and an A1 should be done away with?—I do not think they are necessary.

933. Do you think it would be advisable to adopt a certificate, and to recognise two grades only—first and second?—Yes; but I have not gone very carefully into the matter.

934. You think those high certificates are not necessary in the case of the ordinary primary school?—I do not think they are.

935. You think a man with D1 classification equal to the work in any of the primary schools of the colony?—Yes.

936. How do you judge your teachers—by their literary classification or by their skill?—By their skill.

937. In the matter of salaries paid to male and female teachers, would you suggest that your female teachers should receive the same salary as your assistant masters receive, provided they do exactly the same work?—From a sentimental point of view, yes.

938. If the proposed colonial scale were operative it would benefit your assistants?—Yes.

939. Would it benefit you in regard to staffing?—Yes; we would receive an extra male assistant.

940. In so far as your salary is concerned, the proposed scale would not benefit you if adopted?—No; it would reduce me £23.

941. You would not mind making that sacrifice for the benefit of your school?—Certainly not.

G. Squirrell, Chairman of the Auckland City Schools Committee, examined.

Mr. Squirrell: I desire to give a few particulars in connection with the five city schools. Those particulars I have in tabulated form, and I will hand them in. [Exhibit 66.] My opinion as a layman on this question may not be worth much, but it is this: that I have advocated a colonial scale ever since I had any intimacy with educational matters in Auckland. The knowledge that teachers of the same status are receiving better salaries in other parts of the colony, while the money to pay both is coming from the same source, cannot be very gratifying to a conscientious man. Nothing, to my mind, can so unsettle a person as the knowledge that his income is liable to fluctuation through no fault of his own, and is dependent on the finances of the Board which employs him, or the whim of some members of that Board, who, through motives of economy or other reasons, may propose a reduced scale. Let the salary be adequate to the services rendered, for I believe the profession of a teacher is the noblest work man or woman can be engaged in; and let them feel that, so long as they perform their duties to the satisfaction of their numerous masters, their income is fixed according to a scale that will not be altered unless colonial finances suffer such reverses that they, in common with all, will suffer. We have, as a Committee, had to lose some teachers, who have been lured by the higher rates paid elsewhere, and that others are waiting similar opportunity is no secret. The only objection I can see in the proposed scale is the proposed reduction of the higher salaries now paid. I do not consider that a qualified and successful head-teacher who is called upon to organize and conduct a school of 700 pupils is overpaid at the present rate. We have four head-teachers under our Committee who would be affected by the proposed scale, and I can assure you that they earn their salary, and that we should deplore any reduction being made to them. To do so is simply taking away the "plums" of the profession that younger men look forward to and strive to obtain, not only in this but in other walks of life, and to take them away will probably debar good men from entering the ranks in the future. The average number of pupils per class-teacher in our five schools is 69, and per teacher 47, and we express our gratification at the proposed change in the scale of staff, and confidently hope it will be carried into effect, thus enabling teachers to give that individual attention to their pupils that they at present find to be impossible. We are decidedly of opinion that too great a percentage of females are employed in the service. The reason given is that the existing scale of salaries does not hold out sufficient inducements for young men to remain in it. Figures disclose a great preponderance of females over male teachers employed in the Auckland District. Out of a total number of 789 teachers, 325 are males and 464 females; and if we deduct those of both sexes who are head or sole teachers the figures are still more disproportionate, being 83 males and 353 females. Our experience is that, with the present scale of staff, female teachers frequently break down through overwork. If the question of the overloaded syllabus can be mentioned, I would say that we have repeatedly during the past few years endeavoured to have it reduced. Our Inspectors and teachers are with us in the opinion that we are attempting to teach far too much, and that, given a less number of subjects, better results would be obtained. The deletion from the syllabus of history, the higher branches of arithmetic, and geography would, we contend, make it more suitable to the needs of primary schools.

942. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I gather from what you say that you do not wish to see the salaries in any part of New Zealand reduced?—No.

943. If the vote of £4 capitation is not sufficient to bring all the salaries in New Zealand up to the level of some of the highest that are now obtained, would you be in favour of reducing any of the higher ones, so as to bring all to some general average?—No; I think the vote should be increased if £4 is not sufficient to equalise all without reducing any.

944. Do you think the present system of appointment of teachers is satisfactory?—No; the Board and Committee very often clash in the appointment of a teacher, and sometimes feeling is displayed on the part of the Committee, who do not think the Board has sent in the names of all those eligible.

945. Does the Board exclude the names of eligible men who wish to apply, and sometimes send names of men not so qualified?—I do not think they send the names of ineligible men, but I know that men who have wished their names sent on have not had them so sent on.

946. Eligible men?—Yes.

947. Have you any suggestions to make regarding a system of promotion that you think possible?—No; only a general rule that if an assistant master in a school proves worthy of promotion, and a vacancy occurs in that school, that that school and its Committee should have the benefit of his services, and that he should be promoted and his services retained.

948. Do you not think that the total want of prospect of promotion has as much to do with the dissatisfaction of teachers as inadequate salary?—Decidedly.

949. It is your opinion, then, that the question of promotion should be taken up as earnestly as the question of staffing and salary?—Yes.

950. *Mr. Davidson.*] How long have you been connected with the School Committee in Auckland?—Five years.

951. Is there but one Committee for the whole of the city?—The city district embraces five schools.

952. Do you know any other city in the colony where the same system prevails?—I presume that the large centres will all be in a similar position.

953. Do you know that Dunedin, for instance, has a School Committee for each city school?—No.

954. Do you think it would be an advantage to the city, and education in the city, if that were the case in Auckland?—I do not think so.

955. You think the system obtaining here has its advantages?—Yes.

956. In electing members for the Education Board your city School Committee have only the same voting-power as the Committee of a single school in a remote part of the district?—Yes; that is a grievance we have. We have asked for an amendment of the Act for the past three years.

957. If the five schools had nine members each instead of nine for the five, as at present, you would have forty-five votes for Education Boards elections instead of nine: would not that be an advantage to the city?—In that respect it would be.

958. Can you account for the great preponderance of female assistants over males in the Auckland District?—I think, in the first place, that more females offer their services for the profession than males; and, in the second place, I think that the Board, being hampered in their finance, have naturally had to adopt the cheaper labour.

959. You think the Board gives preference to female labour on account of its cheapness?—They are compelled to do so, I think.

960. Do you not think that the headmaster of a school of 400 in a suburban district who has proved himself competent, efficient, and successful has a greater right to be promoted to the headmastership of a large city school than the man who has not yet proved himself capable in charge of a suburban school: would not the better way be to promote the assistant to the charge of the suburban school, and promote the headmaster of the suburban school to the headmastership of the city school when a vacancy occurs?—That is the system that prevails at the present time in the Auckland District, I understand.

961. You do not mean to say that that is the invariable form of promotion?—Not invariable.

962. Do you not think it would be more just that the master of a medium-sized school should step up into the position of headmaster of a first-class school, and the first assistant of the large school should step into the headmastership of the medium-sized school?—That would be the fairer form of promotion.

963. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think that teachers of the Auckland District are satisfied with the way things are going on?—No.

964. Are the teachers dissatisfied?—Yes.

965. Have they had any reasons during the last few years to dread alterations from time to time in their salaries?—Yes.

966. How has that arisen?—By schemes being proposed by members of the Board for alterations in the scale of salaries.

967. I believe a very large saving is made every year on the city schools?—Yes.

968. Do you think that a larger saving is actually made than ought to be in the administration of city schools?—I am of opinion that a higher scale of salaries should be paid to the assistants, and if that were brought into force more money would be absorbed.

969. Are you satisfied with the maintenance allowance?—Yes, we find it ample for our wants.

970. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long has this system of having one Committee for the Auckland schools been in vogue?—A long time.

971. What is the practice usually followed in this district with regard to making appointments?—The Board make a selection first, the number varying, and they send them on to the Committee to deal with.

972. What is the usual number sent on?—They send us a fair proportion of the names.

973. You have an opportunity of selecting?—Yes.

974. With regard to the transfer of teachers, do the Board adopt the system of transferring teachers from one part of the educational district to another?—Yes.

975. Do you experience any difficulty in obtaining duly trained teachers, seeing that the Normal School is closed?—Yes.

976. Would you favour the re-establishment of the Training-college by the Board, providing that the whole expense and cost of the College be borne by the department?—Decidedly.

977. Is the difficulty in obtaining the services of male pupil-teachers due to the inadequacy of payment?—That is the general opinion of the teaching staff.

978. What becomes of the pupil-teachers when they have finished their pupil-teacher course: are they simply sent about their business if there is no appointment for them?—I think the Board terminate their services if they have no further use for them.

979. Have you residences for teachers in town schools?—No.

980. Do you give them house allowance?—No; it is supposed to be embraced in the salary.

981. *Mr. Hill.*] You think that teachers should be promoted in the same school?—I qualify that by saying that promotion of assistants should take place in a school. I would not say that a first assistant should be promoted to be headmaster over the heads of more eligible men from outside.

982. Do you think that teachers with certificates from the central department, and living in other districts, should have a chance of applying for vacancies in the Auckland District?—Yes. I should like to see teachers here from all parts of the colony.

983. You think that your schools at the present time are understaffed?—Decidedly.

984. Then, of course, your teachers are overworked?—Yes.

985. Who work hardest, from your experience—men or women—if you take into consideration the money they receive?—The women, most decidedly, being physically weaker than men to stand the strain.

986. Does it often come under your notice as Chairman to approve of leave of absence to women in your schools?—Yes.

987. Is the proportion greater than in the case of men?—Yes.

988. What is your opinion as to the giving of salaries to women and men who are called upon to do the same kind of work?—I think, up to a certain point the salaries should be equal. An infant mistress, whom I consider one of the most important teachers in the school, should receive a high remuneration; but for the bulk of female teachers, who leave the service after gaining experience, I think a lower salary would be adequate.

989. A lower salary because they get married?—Because of their liability to leave the service.

990. Do you think that should hinder them from getting the same amount of salary as a man if they are called upon to do the same actual work?—I do not think I would equalise the salaries all through.

991. Is it not a fact that if a teacher has been properly trained he should be able to teach all kinds of children, so far as the primary school is concerned?—Yes.

992. Then, do you think that a teacher who teaches little ones, and is able to teach older pupils, should get a higher salary than one who teaches older pupils and is able to teach infants—you think a teacher should be paid commensurate with the work she is called upon to do?—Yes.

993. And that females and males called upon to do the same work should be paid the same salary?—No; the responsibilities of men and women are not the same.

994. Supposing we have an appointment which can be filled equally well by a man or a woman, and the woman will do the work for two-thirds of the salary a man would get, which would you appoint?—I would appoint the man.

995. Has that been the rule followed here?—The Board has not the supply of male assistants to give us. The cheaper labour is employed necessarily.

996. *Mr. Weston.*] You are not satisfied with educational matters in this district?—No.

997. You are dissatisfied with the administration of the Board?—Yes; but we believe that the Board is not able to do better.

998. Why cannot they do better—want of ability?—No, want of means.

999. Do they dole out the money, in your opinion, justly and equitably to the teaching class?—I believe they do.

1000. All the salaries are fixed, then, upon an equitable basis?—No, not on an equitable basis.

1001. If not fixed upon an equitable basis, how can they be doing justice?—They are fixed on a scale according to the funds available.

1002. Given a certain income, are they doling that out equitably to all the teachers of this district?—Yes.

1003. So that the teachers have no grounds for complaint against the Board?—No.

1004. And if Mr. Justice Cooper was severe on the management of the Board, he was unjust and unfair to the Board?—I do not remember what Mr. Justice Cooper said.

1005. *Mr. Hogben.*] You spoke of the reductions in salaries of headmasters: did you mean that the proposed colonial scale would reduce the salaries of any of your headmasters?—I understand so.

1006. Would you tell the Commission to which school that applies?—I understand that our four large schools would suffer a reduction.

1007. Take the Wellesley Street School, 757 children: what would be the salary payable under the proposed scale for that school?—£372; my reading of this has been wrong.

1008. Wellesley Street suffers a loss of £8; Napier Street, £15; Beresford Street, £11; and Nelson Street, £6 8s., by the proposed scale; but that is supposing that there is no house allowance, and it is only by bringing in the question of no house allowance that the headmasters of these schools suffer. If house allowance were added to this colonial scale they would gain considerably?—Yes.

1009. Did you notice the remarks in the memorandum accompanying the suggested scale regarding house allowance?—Yes; but as there was no house allowance to teachers in our schools we did not take much interest in that phase of the question.

1010. If the Commission were to recommend that the question of house-allowance be part of the scheme, and that a house-allowance be granted where there is no house connected with a school, that would solve the difficulty so far as Auckland is concerned?—Yes.

1011. What is your opinion regarding the expediency of house allowance?—I think it is wrong in the town and suburbs. I think it should only obtain in the country districts, where accommodation is likely to be scarce.

1012. You are aware that in different parts of the colony a good many of the town schools are already provided with residences?—Yes.

1013. Would it not make the salaries still unequal if you gave no house allowance in one case and in another case gave the same salary and a house?—The salaries would be unequal.

1014. Do you see any other way out of it than by giving a house allowance where there is no house?—Either that or abolish the house allowance to town schools.

1015. But there are houses?—Get rid of them, then, or charge rent.

1016. In that case you would have to add something to the salaries to make up for the loss of the house to the teachers?—Yes, I suppose so. I think the salary should be a matter quite apart from the question of the house accommodation.

1017. You would not advocate that a teacher in one place should get a salary and a house, and in another place a teacher get a salary without a house?—Not at all.

1018. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that the children in the Auckland schools are receiving a fair primary education?—Yes and no. They are receiving a fair education, but too much is attempted.

1019. Could you point out the subjects which exhibit a marked weakness?—I have often noticed the Inspectors in their report saying that the common subjects—reading, writing, and dictation—are weak; and our opinion is that if the higher branches of arithmetic and geography were abolished, and history altogether taken away from the syllabus, more time would be devoted to the instruction in the weak subjects.

1020. Do you think that weakness is due in any way to the staff?—No.

1021. Do you think the teaching staff is competent for the work they are asked to do?—On the whole they are.

1022. You said that female teachers are liable to break down physically: is that due to the selection that is made originally of individuals to follow this profession?—No; it is pure overwork.

1023. It is a want of mental stamina, then, that renders this employment not very suitable for ladies?—Not want of it, but too great a demand upon it.

1024. You say there is too great a preponderance of lady teachers: what would you do? Would you undertake the task of sending female teachers about their business, and putting males in their stead?—Yes, in a great many cases.

1025. Would you provide them with any other employment?—I do not know that that employment is required or is necessary for a great many of them. We prefer a preponderance of males to females among teachers.

1026. Are your male assistants equal to the work, do you think?—Yes.

1027. Have you formed any opinion as to the difference in salary that should be paid to a headmaster and a first male assistant?—No; but I think that the first assistant of a large school—take our Wellesley Street School, for instance—should receive about half of what the headmaster is receiving.

Miss Newman, representing the Infants' Mistresses, examined.

Miss Newman: I have to say at the outset that we are very glad to have a colonial scale to criticize at all. The scheme proposed recognises the importance of infant-work and its demands on the teacher, and it almost seems that it is hardly necessary for us to say anything; but we feel that the infant-teacher holds a rather different position to other teachers. She is really the head of a department. That department includes very often half the school, and in large schools comprises one-third of the roll-number. The infant mistress is responsible not only for her own work, but for that of the pupil-teachers under her. Then, the infant-teacher has a peculiarly responsible position, because the children spend more of their school-life under her than under any other individual teacher—about one-third, or three years, of their time at school is spent under the infant-mistress. That three years either makes or mars the whole of the child's school course. In the case of infant-teachers a natural fitness is required, and that makes the supply scarcer than of other teachers, which in itself entitles them to a higher salary. In Auckland the teachers of infant departments have been paid much less than in the southern districts. In one of our largest schools in Auckland the infant-teacher receives £95, and in a southern school a teacher in the same position, with the same number of pupils, receives from £130 to £160. I think infant-teachers deserve special attention from those framing a scale of salaries. There is one thing in connection with the proposed scale, referring to women teachers as a whole, that I would like to refer to. As I read the scale, a women teacher may hold the same position continuously for years, and receive no increase in her pay. Her work may increase, and yet her pay be unaltered. I do not see any provision in the new scheme to alter that. Another thing about the position of the woman teacher in the scheme before me is that her position is alternative with that of the masters, which implies that her position is inferior to that of the man.

1028. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—I have been a teacher for about twelve years. I have been infant mistress for about five years; previous to that I taught standards, and previous to that I taught infants,

1029. Did you serve an apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

1030. What is your present position?—First assistant in a school of 240. I am practically infant-teacher, but the name of my position is that of first assistant.

1031. What are your duties?—I have charge of the infants and Standard I.

1032. What is the average attendance in your class?—About 120.

1033. What assistance have you?—A third-year pupil-teacher.

1034. For that what do you receive?—£85, and it has been the same for five years. I started with 60 pupils and now I have 138, and my salary has not increased with my work.

1035. Under the suggested scale what would your salary be?—Under the first proposed scale £105, and under the alternative £120.

1036. Do you recognise that the work of an infant mistress in any school is very important?—Yes.

1037. Are you satisfied with the proposed increase in your salary?—Yes.

1038. You stated that many of the assistants in city and suburban schools get no increase of salary?—Yes.

1039. Do you not think that often arises from the fact that they refuse or do not care to take position in country districts?—There are teachers I know who have never been offered any other position.

1040. But you do not think they would hesitate before they would accept an increase of £20 or £30 to go into the country?—Some of them would take it, and some of them would not; but £100 in the country would not be much promotion to a teacher who had been getting £85 in the town.

1041. Why not?—Expenses are greater in the country—particularly for a woman.

1042. You do not think that ladies consider the social advantages of the city, and would prefer to accept a lower salary in the city than take a higher salary and go to a country district?—Possibly.

1043. You recognise that the suggested change in staffing would create a much higher number of vacancies for infant mistresses throughout the colony than now exist?—Yes.

1044. *Mr. Stewart.*] As a matter of fact, does not the dislike of many of our lady teachers to go to the country arise from the fact that they would have to live away from home?—In many cases, yes.

1045. Are the lady teachers in this district satisfied with the state of affairs?—No.

1046. Would you say they were not satisfied simply, or what would you say?—I would say they were very indignant about many things.

1047. Are the lady assistants in favour of a colonial scale?—They are indeed.

1048. They would not be satisfied with any other settlement than a colonial scale?—No.

1049. *Mr. Hill.*] What certificate do you hold?—D2.

1050. Were you specially trained as an infant mistress or as a teacher?—I was not specially trained as an infant mistress.

1051. What special qualification do you hold for acting as an infant mistress?—I have no special certificate for special work.

1052. Do you wish to call yourself an infant mistress?—Yes, in virtue of the work I do.

1053. Does the headmaster of the school in which you are engaged take any part in the management of your department?—None at all.

1054. Does he never examine your work?—He examines Standard I. every quarter.

1055. Does he never see what is the character of the work you are doing in the preparatory classes?—No.

1056. Does he supervise the construction of your time-table?—The time-table has been amended by me from time to time while I have been there. I consulted him regarding the alterations I proposed to make.

1057. You recognise he might examine your department if he chose?—Yes.

1058. And do you recognise that if he thought it better he might substitute another lady in your place?—I have never thought of that.

1059. Would you object, supposing he put another in your place whom he thought better than you: would you be willing to go to another class?—If he did not alter my position I would not mind changing the work.

1060. You would be perfectly willing to take Standard III. so long as your salary was maintained?—Yes.

1061. It is not so much a question of name as a question of salary?—If he were to ask me to take any work in the school I would not object so long as it did not lower my salary.

1062. *Mr. Weston.*] Are the lady teachers indignant because they consider that the male teachers are overpaid and that the women are underpaid, or do they think that both male and female teachers, high and low, are alike underpaid?—Yes; they think that all teachers are underpaid, and they think that the women's positions should be open, like the men's, for application. At present female vacancies are not advertised.

1063. I think, as a matter of fact, you were trained in the Onehunga School as an infant mistress?—Yes.

1064. How long was that for?—Three years, or something like that.

1065. Although you hold no special certificate as an infant mistress, yet your experience leads you to conclude that you are a qualified infant mistress?—Yes.

1066. What is the average age of pupils in your class?—From five to eight years; there are nearly 50 over eight.

1067. Do you think that with one pupil-teacher you are able to do justice to those children?—I do not.

1068. Do you think you should have the assistance of a qualified teacher?—I do.

1069. As well as a pupil-teacher?—I think either another assistant or perhaps two pupil-teachers could do the work.

1070. Do you think that you, as mistress of that class, just now are able to do justice to a pupil-teacher?—No; there is so much work to do in connection with the class.

1071. It means that the girl has to work unduly hard after school-hours, and that her health and prospects alike may probably suffer: is that what you mean?—Yes.

1072. Have you in your school sufficient accommodation in the one room for that number of children?—No.

1073. So that you are working under great disadvantages?—Very great.

1074. Have you worked under like disadvantages in other schools?—I have, in Onehunga.

1075. You say that you approve of a colonial scale: would it not meet the case if the Board of Education gave you a sufficient salary—would you then be satisfied with the Board's control?—No.

1076. Why not?—Because I think that the salaries throughout the whole colony should be the same. I do not think that teachers in one district should be differently paid to those in another district.

1077. If you could live more cheaply than another lady could live in another district, would your sense of justice and honour not lead you to the conclusion that the other young lady should get more than you?—Yes, naturally she would receive more.

1078. You think that the lady less favourably situated should get more pay: would not the same principle apply to the unfortunate married man who had a wife and children to support—living in a less favourably situated place? Should he not receive more favourable consideration than another more favourably situated?—The payment of all labour is governed by those laws.

1079. Well, then, what becomes of a colonial scale?—You have not satisfied me that it is easier to live in one place than another.

1080. Do you believe, as a young lady of considerable experience and knowledge, in a pupil-teacher teaching?—I do not think that pupil-teachers can do much real teaching.

1081. In large schools like your own, have you the time to properly supervise the work that your pupil-teacher does?—I have not.

1082. So that, in every way, the school and staff suffer by existing arrangements?—Yes.

1083. *Mr. Hogben.*] Are you aware that in one district in New Zealand some of the assistant mistresses in small schools are getting salaries ranging from £48 to £72?—I am not.

1084. Do you know the Nelson District, or anything about it?—I do not.

1085. Have you any reason to suppose that it is more expensive to live in Auckland than in Nelson, or *vice versâ*?—I have no reason to think it is more expensive to live in one place than another.

1086. There is no reason then, as far as you are aware, why the Nelson teachers should be paid so low a salary?—I think it would be very unjust.

1087. And you think it would be unjust that in Grey or Westland, where living is more expensive, a teacher should be paid very much less than in Auckland, Canterbury, or Otago?—I think it would be very unjust.

1088. You understand perfectly well, from the nature of things, that it is mainly in these small districts that the Boards are, to a great extent, compelled to pay low salaries?—Yes.

1089. That, then, would be another reason in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.

1090. *The Chairman.*] Do you know the reason why there is a larger proportion of lady teachers in the town than in the country?—Lady teachers prefer the town because most of them have their homes there.

1091. Supposing they took charge of small schools in the country?—I know some who would like to go to the country.

1092. Would they advance their pay by going to the country?—Not to any great extent.

1093. When young men go to the country do they receive more than lady teachers?—Yes.

1094. Do you think lady teachers are just as competent to take charge of schools up to 20 as are male teachers?—Yes.

1095. Can you give me any reason why there should be such a great difference in the salaries paid to men and women?—I know of no reason except that they wish to offer greater inducements to the men to go into the country,

1096. Then, it cannot be laid to the charge of the Board that they are discouraging the men in the service?—No.

1097. Do you find the work very hard?—It is very trying.

1098. Have you known any lady teachers in town break down through illness?—Yes.

1099. Have you known any male teachers break down?—I do not recollect any one just now.

1100. Have you had experience in class-work?—I have taught Standard IV.

1101. Is the work in Standard IV. as arduous as the work you are performing as infant mistress?—I think they can hardly be compared.

1102. Which is the more important?—The infant-room.

1103. Then, you consider an infant mistress requires to be mentally and otherwise stronger than an ordinary class assistant?—I do.

1104. Are you of opinion that the higher standards should be reserved exclusively for males?—I have known lady teachers teach the upper standards with very great efficiency. I do not think males could have taught them better.

1105. Do you think a male could teach the infant-class as efficiently as a woman?—I do not.

GEORGE LARGE, Waiuku, examined.

Mr. Large: Under the proposed scale I lose from £9 8s. to £7 per annum. In the winter quarters I would gain £3 12s., and in the summer quarters I would lose £9 12s.; that would make a difference of £6. By the amended scale I would lose £3. I do not come as the accredited representative of any teachers, but I have spoken to as many as I could of those who teach around me, and one man, who lives five or six miles away, expressed himself as opposed to the £10 reduction for a sewing-mistress. I have compared the two scales right from the beginning, and I see that in some cases by the new scale the teacher would gain, and in other cases he would lose.

1106. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] What minimum wage do you think a male teacher should receive in a country district?—I do not think a married country teacher could possibly live on less than £150.

1107. Then, would you begin all schools at that with an attendance of 20?—No; I mean that if a teacher was a married man, and if he had an average of 10, I would give him not less than £150 a year.

1108. What minimum salary would you fix for a man, married or single, with a school of 30 children?—I would not make it a question of school.

1109. You would fix the minimum at what?—For married men not less than £150.

1110. Would you make any difference between the salaries of married and single men?—That is a question I have not considered.

1111. Can you tell me what you think a teacher should begin at?—A single man could not live very well on under £120.

1112. You would give a married man £150, and a single man £120?—Yes, if in charge of a school.

1113. What would you pay a female teacher?—£100.

1114. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your experience?—One month on probation, sole teacher for eighteen months, and headmaster from that time.

1115. What is the lowest average attendance you have had as headmaster of a school?—19.

1116. Have you ever been a pupil-teacher?—No.

1117. Nor a student in a training-college?—No.

1118. And you now occupy the position of headmaster of a school between 55 and 63?—Yes.

1119. What is the staff of the school?—According to the Board's scale I have one pupil-teacher; but, as a matter of fact, I have one girl who has completed her apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher.

1120. She is doing the work of an assistant?—Yes.

1121. You do not give her any instruction for examinations?—I did before she passed her examinations, and up to the present time I carefully supervise the work she does.

1122. What salary does she receive?—She was getting £50 up to the end of March, and now she is getting £55.

1123. What are her duties?—She teaches the infants and the First, Second, and Third Standards.

1124. You teach the rest of the school?—Yes.

1125. What is the average attendance in your department?—About 29.

1126. And in the department of the assistant?—34.

1127. This teacher is doing the work of an infant mistress, is a fully certificated teacher, and is receiving £55 a year: do you think that is adequate pay for the work she does?—I do not think so.

1128. What is the highest average you think a sole teacher can undertake?—35.

1129. If you had the choice of teaching on to 40, instead of 36, and then putting on a fully trained infant mistress, who would take the responsibility of training and teaching the lower part of the school, do you not think that staffing would be better than having a pupil-teacher at 36?—Yes.

1130. You prefer the suggested staffing to that obtaining in Auckland?—Yes.

1131. What is your present salary?—It fluctuates between £160 and £135.

1132. And the average attendance?—In the winter 55, and in summer 63.

1133. What would be your salary according to the alternative scale?—£183 for 63.

1134. Besides approving of the staffing according to this suggested scale, you would have a considerable increase in salary?—Yes, according to the alternative scale.

1135. At the same time you object to the deduction for a sewing-mistress?—Yes.

1136. *Mr. Stewart.*] Are we to understand that the figures quoted by you in your evidence in chief are in error?—Yes, inasmuch as I said I would lose £6 8s. All the figures I quoted were calculated on the first scale of Mr. Hogben's. By the alternative scale my position is greatly improved.

1137. You do not approve of the first scale altogether, but you do approve of the second scale?—Yes, most decidedly.

1138. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long is it since you were in a country school with an average attendance of 30 or 40?—Twelve years and a half.

1139. Do you consider that, with the freedom of classification and grading that exists in these small schools in the country, it is possible for a teacher to teach up to 45 children without any extra assistance?—No.

1140. How do you account for teachers down South teaching up to 45, and, according to the Inspectors, doing so efficiently?—I cannot account for it; but there may be a difference of which I am not aware.

1141. You realise that when schools have liberal staffs they cannot have the same liberal salaries that would otherwise obtain?—Quite so.

1142. It is also evident that if good salaries are given the best teachers will be attracted?—Yes.

1143. And, consequently, when the best teachers are attracted to the district where the salaries are highest, the other districts cannot possibly do such good work?—No.

1144. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you think that the Education Board would be justified in establishing a school with an average attendance of 1, and paying the same salary as to a school of an average attendance of 10?—No, certainly not.

1145. Would you suggest, in the case of schools below 30, that a lady teacher should be placed in charge?—Circumstances alter cases very much, but experienced teachers consider that in small schools of 20 and under lady teachers are more successful than male teachers. There are, however, places too remote and too far away, and where accommodation is too rough for a lady to live.

1146. Do you think a schoolmaster is judged by the certificates he holds, or by the results he produces in his school?—By the results.

1147. Do you not think it would be better, then, to call a man a certificated teacher, and let skill do its own work in the matter of promotion?—That has been my opinion almost since I had any knowledge on which to form an opinion.

1148. Are you aware that that has been the practice in England?—I am not.

1149. *Mr. Weston.*] I think you told us that you could only manage a school up to 35 children?—Yes; when the number exceeds that the work is more difficult to overtake.

1150. *Mr. Hogben.*] Your original statement was based, I understand, on the first proposed scheme?—Yes, on the original scheme.

1151. What is the salary by the alternative scale for a school of 65?—£175.

1152. What is the salary for a school of 63?—£183.

1153. What is the lowest salary for your school that you would receive under the Auckland scale?—£150.

1154. And the highest?—£175.

1155. You will not lose at all on the alternative scale?—No.

1156. Do you think it is better that increases should be made by units rather than by such large differences as would involve an increase in the attendance of 15 for one unit?—Yes, I certainly think that is a splendid feature of the new scale.

1157. Would it not be better and fairer to calculate the average attendance for a longer period, such as one year, than for so short a period as a quarter?—I believe it would. In my own case I believe that would give me a fixed salary of £175 a year.

VINCENT EDWARD RICE, Secretary and Treasurer of the Auckland Board, examined.

Mr. Rice: I have occupied the position of secretary to the Auckland Education Board for nearly twenty-five years. For ten years previously I was an officer of the Auckland Provincial Government, and held the position of Chief Clerk to the Superintendent of the Province up to the time of the abolition of provinces in 1876. I have thus acquired, through official correspondence, a large acquaintance with the circumstances and needs of the country districts of the province. The Auckland Education District is the largest of any in the colony. Its area is over twenty thousand square miles. A glance at the map will show its extent as compared with other districts. From the very first beginning of the Board's administration a large and increasing demand has arisen for the establishment of schools in remote and sparsely settled localities. For many years the Board has had to set up and maintain schools in great numbers at a cost altogether disproportionate to the capitation grant earned by the average attendance at such schools. As long ago as 1879 (July) the Board represented to Government the unfairness of providing for primary education in such cases by a uniform capitation allowance per head of attendance, and Government were then asked to devise a scheme whereby a minimum salary of £120 could be offered to the sole teacher of a country school. In each subsequent annual report the Board has not failed to give prominence to this special difficulty in carrying on the system here. I would like to add that the question of salary is not the only point to be considered. A teacher going to some of the remote places in newly formed settlements has often to endure a considerable amount of hardship as regards food and accommodation. Born and bred amid the comforts of a town life, he or she has to rough it to a greater or less extent; and, although the pioneer settlers of the country districts are, as a rule, most kind and hospitable, the teacher feels the lack of intercourse with other teachers, and privacy for study is often out of the question. Mr. Luke, who has been a member of the Board continuously for twenty-three years, can corroborate my statement that the Board has consistently endeavoured to place the means of education within the reach of all, and to encourage the pioneers of settlement, by establishing and maintaining schools wherever a few children are located beyond the means of access to any existing school. To do this, with the limited means at disposal, it has been necessary to fix a lower scale of remuneration than that which could be afforded if the same number of children could be gathered into fewer schools for instruction. Of late years there has been a considerable removal of population from one district to another, and separate schools have been necessarily brought into existence, with little or no addition to the total number for whom capitation is payable. This has had the effect of gradually diminishing the income of several head-teachers in the older districts. The rapid development of the goldfields at different centres has also contributed to the increase in the number of schools, besides adding to the cost of building. The present number of schools is 392, of which fifty-eight are half-time. The number of teachers of all ranks (exclusive of sewing-teachers) is about eight hundred. The normal average attendance is about 24,000. The total roll-number is about 29,000. In one-fourth of the number of schools the average is less than 20. As an approximate estimate, I should say that there are only sixty-five schools in which the income earned by average attendance is sufficient to cover the cost of maintenance. The surplus earned by these sixty-five schools goes to provide funds for maintaining the remaining 327 schools in the district. Coming to the question of salaries, I will speak separately of each class: Head-teachers: Within the past twenty-five years the scale of salaries has been revised three or four times by the Board, always with an upward tendency, except as regards the latest revision, of which I will speak later. I mean that each revision has resulted in the pecuniary benefit of the head-teachers. As regards schools of less than 15 average, there have been ups and downs. Attempts have been made to throw such schools upon a strict capitation basis of £3 15s. or £4, and to call upon the residents to make up the salary. But experience proved that these were the very cases in which the residents — themselves undergoing the hardships of a struggling country life—could not afford to give pecuniary aid towards the maintenance of their schools. Very considerable difficulty was experienced in getting teachers to go out and undertake such work; and that difficulty was only partly removed by a resolution moved by Mr. Luke in 1892, and adopted by the Board, fixing £70 as a minimum salary to any certificated teacher in sole

charge. The latest scale—known as Dr. McArthur's, and brought into operation in October, 1900 — aimed at improving the pay of teachers of the smaller schools, whose salaries were thereby increased by an aggregate of about £800 a year. Towards the increased expenditure a sum of about £718 was obtained by reducing the scale of salaries of forty-two head-teachers in charge of schools above 100 average attendance, it being stipulated that, if the capitation grant should be increased to £4, their salaries should be restored to the previously existing scale. (With the consent of the Minister, that promise has been carried out in the distribution of the vote for additions for the March quarter). With the exception just named, head-teachers have not suffered loss by variation of the scale of their salaries. But the fluctuation of salaries (through reduced attendance) has been a cause of anxiety and trouble to many. If a head-teacher is to do his duty faithfully and fearlessly he should be protected as far as possible against the uncertainty as to what his salary for next quarter will be. Besides the causes of weather and sickness, there are other preventible reasons which contribute to a decrease of salary. Ill-formed roads, employment of children at work, truancy of children, children being kept at home through pique or indifference on the part of the parent: these are matters which help to create a want of certainty as regards salary which ought not to be. An inequality exists in the matter of residences. There are in this district 137 schools (not including any under 15 average) which are as yet unprovided with residences. The Board has not been in a position to grant allowances in lieu of residence. The Board has again and again appealed in vain to Government for a special grant to build residences. In any scale of salaries, whether colonial or local, the question of residences is a most important factor. Mention should be made of the teachers of half-time schools. Their salaries are calculated upon the joint average of the two schools, for which full capitation is paid by Government, and most of them teach six days a week, receiving an additional allowance of £15 or £20 up to but not beyond a maximum of £150 in all. There appear to be a few cases in which the maximum should be increased. Assistant teachers: Within the period above named the salaries of assistants have undergone a decrease. For example, the first assistant masters used to receive a maximum of £250. When the capitation grant was reduced from £4 5s. to £4, and afterwards to £3 15s., these salaries were brought down to a maximum of £225, and thence to a maximum of £200. I do not mean that the individual teachers themselves were reduced; they were absorbed into other positions, and their successors were appointed at a lower salary. For many years the rank and file of assistants were paid according to classification and service, £80 being the minimum of a male, £60 that of a female, and £120 the maximum of a female assistant. Various attempts were made from time to time to bring into operation a definite scale for the payment of assistants. But the proposed scales were not favourably received, and they were withdrawn by the Government. Other attempts were made without success to frame an acceptable and practicable scale. These draft scales proposed to regulate the salaries of assistants according to size of school, position in school, and classification of teacher, a substantial bonus being proposed for those holding certificates of the letters A, B, C, and D. However, no scale was adopted. The salaries of assistants continued to be adjusted from time to time, according to promotion of certificate solely, up to a limit of £100 a year for females and £200 for males. About the end of 1897 Mr. Luke brought forward a scale for the payment of assistants, which was adopted by the Board (with some modification—*e.g.*, excluding a proposed bonus for certificates of A, B, and C), and was made to apply to assistants appointed from January, 1898. That is the scale now printed as in force. Existing salaries in excess of the scale were not reduced; but those which were below the scale were raised. This scale gave immediate increases to the extent of about £700 a year. I ought to have mentioned that prior to this the salaries of first assistant masters were dealt with by the adoption of the present printed scale in November, 1896. This scale was expressly declared to be "prospective, and not to interfere with existing arrangements." This scale has been applied regularly to all assistant masters appointed since January, 1897. Up to March, 1899, no special provision was made for the remuneration of infant mistresses. Mr. Bagnall (the present Chairman of the Board) introduced the present printed scale for this purpose, which was adopted by the Board, with the same proviso as before—viz., that no exising higher salary should be reduced during the present tenure of the appointment. It may be repeated that the cost of providing for the maintenance of so many small schools has precluded the Board from framing a higher scale for the payment of assistants, male and female. Pupil-teachers: Prior to 1897 the salaries of pupil-teachers were: First year—males £30, females £20; second year—males £40, females £30; third year—males £50, females £40; ex-pupil-teachers (certificated)—males £55, females £45. In each case an allowance was made of £10 a year to those living away from home. In framing new regulations for the employment of pupil-teachers the Board was met by an objection from the Minister to any difference of pay between the sexes. It was impossible to meet the cost of bringing up the females to the males. The scale adopted in the new regulations was as follows: First year, £20; second year, £25; third year, £35; fourth year, £45; with an allowance of £10 to those living away from home. The Board has found it necessary to increase the allowance in remote or expensive districts to £20. In this district pupil-teachers are not dispensed with at the termination of their apprenticeship. Those taken on under the old regulations are retained for a period of three years above and beyond the three-years term of their apprenticeship, and employment (in town or country) is given them either as sole teachers or as assistants. Most of them receive such appointments before the end of their six years, and few (if any) have to wait more than a month or two for re-employment. The number of such ex-pupil-teachers has been thus reduced since December, 1899, from ninety-five to twenty-five. Pupil-teachers taken on under the new regulations (February, 1897) are indentured for three years and a half. The Board at its last meeting resolved to continue for six months longer the services of fifty-four whose term of indentures had expired. It should be made known that, of the number of pupil-teachers and junior assistants (counted as pupil-teachers) employed by the Board, no fewer than fifty are

certificated teachers, so that the staffing of the schools in which pupil-teachers so largely preponderate is really stronger than appears on paper. In regard to the preponderance of female pupil-teachers over male, the lower salary introduced in 1897 may have tended to cause males to refrain from entering the teaching profession, but I think the real cause is to be found in the increased prosperity of trades and other openings in life. In spite of all, the proportion of male teachers, although too low, is surely and steadily increasing, and it may be mentioned that the entries for the annual examination of candidates (which have just closed) give a total of thirty-five males, as compared with ninety-eight females. Retiring-allowances: The Board has adopted a scheme for the payment of an allowance ranging from three months' to six months' salary to teachers retiring from the service through ill-health or physical incapacity. Absence of teachers: Leave of absence on account of illness carries at least a month's full salary. Afterwards each case is dealt with on its merits. It cannot be said that the provision made by the Board is other than most liberal. Allowances to School Committees: The scale of allowances to Committees does not represent the whole amount devoted to the repair of buildings and premises. Two foremen carpenters are constantly employed, who go about as required (under direction of the architect) to effect necessary repairs. Grants are also constantly being voted to Committees for special repairs and improvements, or for the purchase of apparatus. These grants are distinct from the ordinary school-fund allowance set forth in the Board's regulations.

1158. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] How do you find the half-time schools—satisfactory?—They are mostly reported, on the whole, as satisfactory. There are some districts where the half-time schools are preferred by the parents, as giving them an opportunity of employing their children on the farms,

1159. What numbers attend these schools?—There are some half-time schools with as many as 30 in attendance, but generally the number is about 15.

1160. Do the people in the district where there are 30 children attending a half-time school not ask for a full-time school?—In one of them an application has just come in for a full-time school. Objection is generally taken to a half-time school before it is established, but afterwards the residents are generally satisfied.

1161. And the results, as far as the pupils are concerned, how do they compare with full-time schools?—I think the Inspectors should speak on that. The Inspectors tell me that very good work is done in the half-time schools. This year a junior scholarship was obtained by a pupil from a half-time school.

1162. Have you adopted the principle of driving pupils to central schools, and so obviating the necessity of establishing a number of smaller schools?—No.

1163. You stated that during the past twenty-five years the tendency had been to increase the salary of the headmasters and reduce that of the assistants: can you tell me why that is so?—I cannot say why the Board did it.

1164. You give no opinion on it?—I think it was simply because of the overflowing supply of assistants.

1165. Had you not as good a supply of head-teachers as of assistants?—Most of our schools are in the country, and it has been necessary to make the position of the teacher in the country as high as possible in order to encourage the teachers to go from town to the country. Most of the assistants are employed in the town, and there are many teachers who prefer to stay in town at a small salary rather than go into the country.

1166. What is your opinion as to the relative salary that should be paid to the first assistant teacher as compared with the head-teacher of a town school?—From a half to two-thirds of that paid to the head-teacher. By that means the positions would be filled by men who had had experience in charge of large country schools.

1167. You have established a retiring-allowance for teachers leaving the service?—Yes; leaving the service through sickness, ill-health, or old age.

1168. What happens when a teacher gets leave of absence?—Full salary is paid for the first month, and after that each case is dealt with on its merits, and in most cases liberally. I will give two recent instances. In one case the head-teacher of a large country school fell ill during the summer holidays, contracting typhoid fever. His salary was paid in full for January, February, and March. He died in March, and the Board voted his widow three months' salary as in April. The second case was that of a pupil-teacher in a town school who was taken ill immediately after the school reopened. His salary has been paid in full for February, March, April, and May, and will be paid in full for June also.

1169. What allowance did you pay to the Rev. Mr. Coates previous to his last illness?—It would amount to a large sum. There is no teacher in the service who has had longer leave of absence at different times than Mr. Coates.

1170. Could you give me the amount approximately?—Mr. Coates's service began in May, 1879, when he was a teacher in the country. In 1883 he had three months' leave of absence through illness on full pay. In 1895 he was absent for two months, and there were several extended absences from time to time. Altogether his absences on full pay, previous to his last illness, will come to about one year.

1171. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you consider that the main reason why salaries are lower in this district for certain classes of teachers than in other parts of the colony is due to the fact that you have so many small schools—so many schools that are not payable?—Yes; I said so.

1172. Have you compared the salaries paid to head-teachers in Auckland with those paid for similar positions in other districts?—I have looked at a few isolated cases.

1173. Do you think that the Auckland head-teachers' salaries compare at all favourably with those paid in other districts in the colony?—I believe that the salaries of head-teachers of large schools do compare favourably, but the salaries of head-teachers of smaller schools are lower in Auckland.

1174. Can you give any other reason than that given to Mr. Mackenzie as to why the salaries of assistants should be so much lower in Auckland than in other districts?—I have stated also as a reason that the Board has not enough money.

1175. Do you think it is fair that under a national system of education teachers in different districts, holding similar qualifications, and doing the same kind of work, should be paid at different rates?—I think it is desirable that there should be uniformity in the payment of teachers throughout the colony.

1176. Do you think that under any other capitation system on the same lines as that obtaining in the colony at the present time it would be possible, unless a uniform or colonial scale of salary were introduced?—With a liberal increase of the capitation grant.

1177. Under any capitation grant, could you have a uniform scale of salaries so long as the Boards were allowed to frame their own scales?—I think uniformity could not be obtained, but a liberal scale could be given by increasing the capitation grant.

1178. Do you consider that it is desirable that there should be a uniform scale of staffing and a uniform scale of salary for the colony?—I have said that I consider that in a national system of education there should be uniformity of salaries.

1179. Have you considered the suggested scale of salaries submitted to the Commission by the Inspector-General?—I have not exhaustively considered it, but I have looked through it.

1180. What is your opinion as to the suggested salaries for the various positions?—I think that the salaries for the schools between 15 and 19 are too small.

1181. What is the minimum suggested salary for a school of 15?—£80.

1182. And the maximum?—£100.

1183. Do you consider that too small?—Yes.

1184. What is your opinion as to the proposed salaries for the higher grades of schools?—I have formed no opinion. I merely heard yesterday in evidence that they were about the same. I have not worked them out myself.

1185. Do you think they are fairly liberal from 40 to 65?—Not so liberal as the Board's present scale.

1186. What is the Board's present scale for a school with an average attendance of 65?—£175, and nearly always a house as well.

1187. Here it is £185—the alternative scale?—Oh, yes, that scale is evidently higher.

1188. Then, schools from 90 to 120, the salary varies from £210 to £225: in your opinion, is that sufficient?—I should be glad to see that increased. It is higher than is paid in Auckland.

1189. Would you look at the salaries paid to infant mistresses in schools from 40 to 65? The suggested salary is £90: what is your opinion as to that?—I think it is satisfactory.

1190. Then, in schools from 65 to 90 the suggested salary is £100: what is the salary in Auckland?—The highest salary in the Board's scale is £95, and the lowest £70.

1191. In your opinion, is the salary of £100 ample?—Of course, £100 is better than £95; but to say it is ample is another thing. The scale would better the position of the Auckland assistant teachers very much.

1192. It appeared from the evidence given by a witness the other day that the Board had treated one of the most highly cultivated teachers in a shabby way—I refer to Miss Shrewsbury, who, it was stated, had £2 10s. taken off her salary: would you like an opportunity of explaining that?—I did not happen to be in the room, and therefore did not know what the witness said; but I will tell you the facts of the case. Miss Shrewsbury was one of the teachers engaged by the Board to instruct pupil-teachers, the engagement being terminable by three months' notice. For a long time the Board considered the doing-away with the Saturday classes, and finally, in September, 1900, the Board decided to notify the four teachers of the classes that their engagements would end at the end of the year—that was, three months after the notice was given. That notification was conveyed to the four teachers. No further action was taken until the Board's first meeting in February, when the Board decided to carry on the classes—reopening the mathematics and Latin classes, and leaving the other two classes to be reopened afterwards. Miss Shrewsbury was the teacher of mathematics. The four teachers were offered re-engagement, but the French and science masters had in the meantime accepted appointments in Christchurch and Dunedin respectively. The Board advertised for those two vacancies, and on the 19th February at a special meeting made appointments. The allowances of these teachers are paid in one quarterly abstract. When the time came for the preparation of the abstract the instruction given was that the salary of the teachers of Latin and mathematics was to begin as from the 1st February, and the salary of the other two from the date of their appointment, 19th February.

1193. Miss Shrewsbury's reappointment dated from the 1st February?—It was made on the 6th February, but was dated from the 1st.

1194. Did she carry out precisely the same duties as the previous year?—So far as I know, there was no change in the duties.

1195. Did Miss Shrewsbury ever apply for the January salary?—I never heard of her applying for it.

1196. You admit, I suppose, that she would have a legal right to claim for the January salary even if her engagement terminated on the 31st December?—No, I do not. Had payment been made for the January month the auditor might have disallowed it. When an officer's salary is increased the auditor looks at the minute-book to see the date on which the increase was authorised.

1197. *Mr. Stewart.*] Did Miss Shrewsbury perform any less work for the quarter ending 31st March, 1901, than she did for the quarter ending March, 1900, or March, 1899?—So far as I know, she did not.

1198. The position simply is this: that for the previous two years she received £7 10s. for what she was paid £5 on this occasion?—I think the first class was started on the 9th February.

1199. In examination you spoke of what you thought should be the proportion of the salary of the first assistant to the salary of the headmaster, and your answer was one-half to two-thirds The assistant masters in their evidence have suggested that the proportion should be three-fifths: is that your opinion also?—Somewhere about that.

1200. With regard to this scheme of retiring-allowances, and allowances to teachers when sick, what was the date of its adoption?—The scheme, as a resolution, was adopted only a few months ago, but it has been the practice of the Board for many years past.

1201. You have told the Commission that the frequent fluctuation of salaries has created dissatisfaction among the teachers; but is it not a fact that it has not been a question of the number of scales actually enforced that has caused the unrest among the Auckland teachers so much as the frequent discussion at the Board's meetings of proposed scales during the last seven years, so many of which have been put into effect?—I should say probably it is; but I also say that the Auckland teachers have cried out before they were hurt, or before they were likely to be hurt. Some of the schemes were so palpably impracticable that they could not possibly come into force.

1202. What teachers have generally been sent to the small schools—14 to 19—in the Auckland District—teachers who have been in the service for a long time, or young men who have just come out of their apprenticeship?—They are young men and young women who have certificates, and have shown during their pupil-teacher course their aptitude for promotion.

1203. They are practically teachers commencing their careers—just out of their indentures?—Most of them have had no other experience than that of a pupil-teacher.

1204. Then, we may take it that that is the stage at which they expect lower salaries than at any other stage of their employment?—Yes, I think so.

1205. So that the objection urged against these salaries not being high enough has to be considered along with the fact that the salaries are for young people, and for young people only?—I think, from that point the salaries should be improved.

1206. Can you tell what relative proportion the amount paid in salaries bears to the amount paid in incidentals?—I can state what it was during 1900. In 1900 the capitation for teachers' salaries was £3 4s. 1d., and the grants to School Committees entered as incidental expenses was 6s. 2d. per head.

1207. What other grants were made?—That includes all such grants except those coming under the building grant.

1208. The charge for the carpenters comes under the building grant?—Yes.

1209. You spoke of the scale put into operation on the 1st September, by which the teachers of forty-two schools were reduced: do you think that that leaves sufficient number of prizes to induce the best candidates to enter the profession?—I think not.

1210. You have seen in this proposed colonial scale of salaries a suggestion with regard to house allowance: I think that suggestion is in accord with the recommendations of your Board from time to time, making the house allowance a charge on the building grant?—I do not know that the Board ever suggested that. The Board asked for money to put up the buildings themselves.

1211. What is your opinion as to the recommendation?—I think it is very reasonable that the house allowance should be made a charge on the building grant.

1212. This scale—especially the alternative scale—would materially benefit the country teachers more than any other class?—I have already stated that I do not consider the salaries for the smaller country schools are high enough in this scale; but it would benefit those teachers.

1213. What is your opinion as to the number of small schools in the district: do you think a system of conveyance of children to central schools could be adopted?—The cases that we could deal with in that way could be counted on the fingers of one hand. I can at present only think of one, but there might be two or three others.

1214. Has your Board transferred any money from the Maintenance Account to the Building Account during the last two or three years?—No.

1215. Could you tell me when the Board abandoned that practice?—After the interview with Mr. Reeves, when he was Minister of Education.

1216. What amount had been transferred up to that time?—£10,000. That was, I think, prior to 1890.

1217. It has never obtained from that time till now?—No.

1218. *Mr. Luke.*] From your knowledge of educational matters here for a number of years, can you say if it is a fact that when the provinces were abolished the Auckland Education District began with really no money at all: it had no endowments, and had to start from the beginning, and get money from the Government?—So far as I know, the only money for building schools at all in the Auckland District was a sum of £5,000 or £10,000 handed over from the sale of what was the old Supreme Court site, now the City Hall.

1219. Mr. Walker, a teacher of the Wellesley Street School, dealt with an injustice that had been done him in not getting a salary of £200 when he was appointed to the position at that salary: do you know anything about that?—The position was advertised with a stated salary of £200 a year. Mr. Walker was appointed, and he was notified that he was appointed at a salary at the rate of £200 a year. These words were added: "Your appointment is subject to the provisions of the Act and to the regulations of the Board." The scale which I refer to in my statement was adopted by the Board to apply to all appointments made subsequent to 1896. Mr. Walker was appointed in June, 1897, and thereby came under that scale.

1220. A great deal has been said about a superannuation fund for teachers: do you recollect, many years ago, when a Pensions Bill was brought into the House how that Bill was received by the Auckland teachers?—The teachers could not agree, and that virtually threw it out.

1221. The Board of Education approved of the Bill, and recommended that it should be made a statute as soon as possible?—Yes.

1222. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider that the Auckland Board has been rather liberal in the staffing of its schools?—Judged by its present scale, I should think not.

1223. According to the present staffing, does it take the teachers all their time to overtake their work?—I am never in the schools, and therefore I cannot answer that question. I can only say that we are often asked for another teacher, and whenever any one is away a message is sent in for some one to be sent to take his place.

1224. Do you consider that too many small schools have been established in this district?—I think there have been instances where schools have been established that might have been done without.

1225. I suppose a good deal of pressure is brought to bear on the Board to establish these schools in outlying places?—I do not think so. I think every application is referred to the Inspector, who visits the district and sends in an impartial report.

1226. I suppose the Board would experience considerable difficulty if they propose to close any of these small schools already opened?—Yes; some have been already closed.

1227. You do not think it would be well that the department should stipulate that there should be a minimum number of pupils for the opening of a school?—I think that would act very cruelly in some districts. It would enable our Board to compete almost with Otago in the payment of teachers.

1228. Do the Auckland Board give preference to female teachers because their salaries are lower?—The Board, I think, has never refused an application from an eligible male teacher.

1229. Do the Committees give a preference to females in recommending teachers?—Committees of country schools as a rule wish to have a male teacher.

1230. Do you not think that there are more pupil-teachers in the Auckland District than it is judicious to employ?—Certainly.

1231. Would you favour the substitution of an assistant teacher for two pupil-teachers where practicable?—In the larger schools, certainly.

1232. In regard to the cost of living, would you consider it practicable to differentiate between the salaries paid to teachers living in districts where the cost of living is exceptionally high and those paid where the cost of living is only normal?—That seems to be one of the objections to a colonial scale.

1233. Is it not possible that in the same education district the cost of living may differ very considerably?—It is quite possible.

1234. Does the Auckland Board differentiate in any way?—No, beyond that some districts have houses, others have not. Of course, it is done to a small extent in regard to the allowances to junior teachers living away from home. The allowance in that case is increased from £10 to £20.

1235. Do you require four years' service from your pupil-teachers, or only three?—Three and a half.

1236. I think employment is found for them when their apprenticeship is over?—Up to the present time, yes.

1237. Do you not think it would be better if we had a uniform examination of pupil-teachers for the whole colony instead of each Board fixing its own examination?—I do not altogether think so. That would entail all the examinations being held at the same time, and I think that the differing circumstances of the various education districts make it convenient that the examinations should be held at different times.

1238. Would not the same apply to the teachers' examinations, E and D?—It does. Already they have been altered once or twice, and even now the examination interferes with the teachers' vacation.

1239. Do you consider that the salary proposed to be paid to pupil-teachers in this scale is adequate?—£20 is quite adequate for a pupil-teacher living in his own home, but if away from home it is not enough.

1240. Do you consider that the allowance to School Committees is sufficient?—The only complaints we hear are from districts where schools have been built at a time when there was a large population there. The attendance, owing to the removals from the district, has gone down, and accordingly the grant for cleaning purposes has gone down, but the large school-building remains.

1241. Are you in favour of a wide difference in the payments to male and female teachers, or a small difference, or are you in favour of equal payment where the work is just as efficiently performed by females as it would be done by males?—I say at once that the work done by male and female teachers cannot under any circumstances be regarded as the same. But I do say that if the salaries of males and females were equalised the ultimate effect would be to drive the females out of the service.

1242. Do you think that the difference in the salary should be made not so much on account of the service rendered, but on account of the responsibility rendered to the State by males in comparison with females?—In the first place, the female teacher has, as a rule, to support only herself, whilst, as a rule, the male teacher has to support others who are dependent upon him.

1243. Is it your experience here that a large proportion of the female teachers leave the service through getting married?—A goodly number, according to whether the times are good or bad.

1244. There are always a large proportion of them who do not look to the profession as their profession through life?—Apparently not.

1245. Have you experienced any difficulty in getting trained teachers since the Normal School has been closed?—Since the Normal School has been closed the Board has employed teachers

trained in the rough-and-ready way in the schools in the district. Hardly any trained teachers from the outside have entered the service.

1246. Do you think that training-colleges should be established in the four centres and maintained by the Government?—I am doubtful as to training-colleges altogether; but, if established, I think the cost ought to be borne by the Government.

1247. Have you separate scholarships for the town and country scholars?—Yes.

1248. Do you think that the adoption of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries would tend in any way to diminish the power and influence of the Education Boards?—I do not see why it should.

1249. *Mr. Hill.*] Can you tell what the amount of profit is from the sixty-five paying schools?—I could not tell that without a calculation being made; but I may say that I referred to schools of which the average attendance is over 75.

1250. Do you know the cost of maintenance per head of the schools outside the sixty-five large schools?—The cost per head of teachers' salaries alone in the 290 schools outside that limit was £4 7s. 2d. In some of the smallest schools the cost per head for teachers' salaries was as high as £8, or even £10.

1251. Do you consider that your sixty-five paying schools are fully staffed?—No. There is a class of school in which I think there might, with advantage, be another teacher. It is the school between 200 and 400 in average attendance, in which the headmaster has to do a considerable amount of class-teaching. There, I think, more help should be given.

1252. Do you consider that the teachers in these sixty-five schools are well paid?—It would be absurd for me to say I consider they are all well paid. I think some of the salaries are adequate and others are too low. In fact, the Board has recognised that all these twenty-five years.

1253. Do you think the capitation allowance of £4 5s. was too large to carry on the schools efficiently?—Certainly not.

1254. What salaries did the headmasters in your larger schools receive—higher or lower than now?—I cannot answer that at this time without turning up the reports. The assistants certainly were paid higher.

1255. Supposing the Government made a grant of 5s. capitation to the Board for the benefit of teachers, could you suggest what teachers would be benefited?—I think that as the forty-two head-teachers of the larger schools had their salaries reduced in order to benefit the teachers of the smaller schools they should be placed back in the position they formerly occupied. That is the first thing. Then I think a further increase should be made to the salaries of the teachers of the smaller schools, and then I think there should be a well-proportioned improvement in the salaries of the assistant teachers.

1256. Now, assuming that the capitation was 10s., thus bringing it back to the old sum of £4 5s., would it enable the Board to pay salaries as high as ever were paid by the Board?—Certainly.

1257. Notwithstanding the creation of the small schools?—I think it would.

1258. Is the proposed colonial scale better or worse than the scale of your Board?—I have not studied it sufficiently, but there is one thing in the scale that I would like to point out as being unduly high. The junior assistant for a school is put down at a salary of £80. I think that salary is unnecessarily high; and I would like to see £10 or £15 taken off and added to the teachers of the smaller country schools.

1259. What do you understand by "junior assistant"?—The Board has, I think, about a dozen teachers who are neither pupil-teachers nor full assistants.

1260. Have they certificates?—Most of them have.

1261. Have they received training as pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1262. Could your Board, with 5s. extra, supply as generous a scale as the proposed colonial scale?—I doubt it.

1263. In your evidence you spoke of the disadvantage which teachers in the country have as compared with teachers in the town: is that disadvantage not compensated for by the residence?—It does to some extent; but the man is still in the country, and is debarred from the advantages of town life.

1264. Do you approve of the department fixing the scale?—If it is a good scale I do not think it matters who fixes it.

1265. Have you any means for continuing the training of you pupil-teachers after they have completed their apprenticeship?—None whatever; but the Board is taking steps to put up a model school which will give ex-pupil-teachers an opportunity of seeing for themselves the teaching of a school under a sole teacher before going to take charge of a country school.

1266. I notice in the work that is set for the preparation of pupil-teachers there is no provision for any work in school-management?—Oh, yes, there is—in the programme of examination of pupil-teachers.

1267. You are satisfied with the amounts offered for pupil-teachers in the proposed scale?—No.

1268. Would you suggest the direction in which an improvement might take place?—I think an improvement might be made by increasing the allowance to pupil-teachers when obliged to live away from home.

1269. You do not object to the amounts to be paid in salary?—No.

1270. Do you think that the penalising of fifth-year pupil-teachers by giving them the salary of a third-year pupil-teacher is a desirable proposal to make?—Certainly not.

1271. Do many of your pupil-teachers obtain certificates before the completion of their apprenticeship?—Yes.

1272. Do you limit the appointment of teachers to those from your own schools, or do you bring in any from outside?—A few have been brought in.

1273. Within the last few years?—Not many within the last few years.

1274. *Mr. Smith.*] What attendance do you think there should be before capitation is allowed on a school?—10.

1275. If the number fell to less than 10 do you think the district should be deprived of teaching?—No; I think travelling teachers could be appointed, each to visit, say, three schools.

1276. Of the 239 pupil-teachers you had last year what percentage would require to live away from home?—I think the number was about fifty.

1277. Is it not rather an exception for them to live away from heme?—No; the number is over a hundred.

1278. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] How low must the attendance fall before the Board closes up a school?—I have known it to fall down to 5 before the school was closed.

1279. Some one told me of a place—Kerikeri, I think it was—where there were a number of children, and the school was standing empty?—I do not know of any place where that is the case.

1280. Do you think that your Board has been able to give a fair education to most of the children in this district?—Certainly; it has reached further than could have been expected of it.

1281. Do you find any difficulty with the building grant?—We have not got half enough, and we find the greatest difficulty in persuading the department that this is a newly settled district.

1282. Do you think that 11s. 3d. will pay your incidental expenses?—I would not like to commit myself to that. It might just now; but in three months' time the circumstances might be different, and it might not suffice.

1283. *Mr. Weston.*] What do you think about centralising the Inspectors at Wellington?—I think, in theory, it seems the right thing to do; but it must be remembered that the Inspectors are really the eyes of the Board, and no Board can afford to part with its eyes if it is to do its work intelligently.

1284. What is your method of dealing with the relieving of sick teachers?—The Auckland Board employs several relieving-teachers. Last year fifteen such teachers were employed in this district, the salaries amounting to £1,400.

1285. Are special teachers appointed for that work, or do you appoint such teachers as may be temporarily out of employment?—The latter mostly.

1286. With regard to the syllabus, do you think there should be a differentiation for the town and country schools?—It seems to me that a country school taught by one teacher is unable to overtake all the subjects on the syllabus, and I do not think that the Inspectors expect it.

1287. Do you think it is a matter of justice that children in the country should be penalised thereby, simply because circumstances have compelled them to attend these country schools?—I think the country children should receive an education equal in every respect to the town children.

1288. Extreme facilities in the country schools should be given, if necessary, to enable the children to receive an education equal to that given in the town schools?—Yes.

1289. You told us just now that there were many suggested alterations in your scales during the last few years: why were there so many?—I think because of the frequent changes in the *personnel* of the Board. I think that new members came in with a desire to put things on a better basis, and each tried his hand on a scale.

1290. And were all the members of the Board prepared to give way to any person who moved a resolution in that direction?—I make it a rule never to express my opinion on the opinions or actions of the members of the Board.

1291. If a colonial scale were framed each Board would naturally have to send its monthly returns to Wellington, would it not?—That would be a matter, I think, for the department to answer; not for me.

1292. Would not that necessarily arise?—It might be done by inspection, on behalf of the department, of the Board's pay-list.

1293. Some provision would have to be made?—Yes.

1294. That would mean a certain amount of extra work in the Government office and in the office of the Board of Education?—Certainly, in the Board of Education office.

1295. Would not there be an amount of uncertainty as to what would be required—say, in regard to either a reduction or an addition to the monthly pay-sheet, by reason of altered circumstances?—I understand you mean that the Board would be in a state of uncertainty as to how much of the capitation would be required for the teachers—certainly.

1296. Naturally, it would follow that at the end of a year the Government would be under or over the amount they had estimated for the teachers' salaries during that year?—It is not possible that they could hit the exact amount, of course.

1297. What is your opinion in respect to a colonial scale, always assuming that a certain amount be voted by Parliament for the maintenance of our schools throughout the colony?—The general advantage in a colonial scale seems to me to be that it should be fixed—either that it could not be varied, or that it would require some legislative action to vary it.

1298. Would it not be better for the various Boards to assess the salaries, and in so doing to regard all the circumstances of their districts and schools?—I think, if you had a sufficient sum voted for capitation, it could satisfy all the teachers in the district.

1299. Would it not be better in the long-run that the Board of Education should frame its own salaries?—I think it would be safer for the Board's finance.

1300. Do you think it would be as safe for the teachers as a colonial scale?—I have pointed out that the *personnel* of the Board changes very rapidly, and there may be variations in the scale; and I think there would be less likelihood of variations in the scale if it were a colonial scale.

1301. The circumstances of the various provincial districts are not always the same?—Certainly.

1302. Do you think, in face of that, that a colonial scale would be just to all the teachers of the colony?—I think it is on that point that the teachers partly desire a colonial scale; and I think it would be a good thing to let it be tried.

1303. The cost of living—the cost of house-rent, medical and professional services, and so on—is not the same throughout the colony? There are variations in each district? You admit that?—Generally, yes.

1304. Admitting that, do you think that a colonial scale of salary would be just to all the teachers throughout the colony?—No scale could avoid pressing unequally on some teachers.

1305. It would be apt, then, to work inequitably in some instances?—For the reasons you have stated, yes.

1306. What in your opinion should be the minimum salary of a teacher, either male or female, in your schools?—I have already said that I considered £120 should be the salary aimed at for the teacher in charge of a small country school.

1307. Would that be for male or female?—Male.

1308. Well, then, in the small country school, do you think there should be any difference between the salary of a male and female teacher?—I do not think there need be.

1309. Up to what number of children, then, do you think the salary of a male and female should be equal in amount?—To about 25.

1310. And I need scarcely ask you whether you think ladies are more suitable than males for teachers of our small schools?—Infinitely more suitable.

1311. What is your method of payment of teachers?—Once a month. Either by the teacher, if in town, calling at the office of the Board, or by the payment of the cheque in to the bank to the teacher's credit; by remitting by post-office order, the cost of the order being charged to the teacher; or, which is more frequently followed, by posting to the teacher a crossed cheque, accompanied by a filled-in receipt and an addressed envelope.

1312. Your teachers are paid without reference to the School Committees?—Yes.

1313. Your incidentals last year amounted to 6s. 2d.: were you satisfied with the sufficiency of that sum?—Of course, you must take one year with another. I think 6s. 6d. may be stated as satisfactory.

1314. What did your expenditure embrace?—Allowances to School Committees for cleaning, school stationery, minor repairs, and fuel.

1315. Did that include caretaking?—There are no caretakers' residences in Auckland.

1316. I suppose you have to pay cleaners: did that 6s. 3d. include that item?—Yes, it included the cleaning of the schools.

1317. Are the country schools kept clean, nicely equipped, and everything in perfect order—? I do not know that the cleaning is perfectly satisfactory.

1318. And I presume that to keep the school well cleaned and scrubbed, &c., is a costly business?—In the early days it used to be done by the children, under the direction of the teacher.

1319. If the schools were kept clean and in first-class order, would 6s. 6d. be enough?—A great deal more labour could be spent in cleaning schools, no doubt. There is not sufficient in the 6s. 6d. to keep the grounds in such order as they should be.

1320. Have your incidentals been augmented by concerts and private subscriptions?—A little is done in that way; but concerts are generally for some special purpose, such as the purchase of a flag-staff, and not for expenditure on repairs.

1321. Why, in your opinion, should a young boy or girl learning the profession as a pupil-teacher receive such liberal pay as is proposed, and as has been given?—I think it is desirable to attract to the profession the best of our young people, and, if possible, those who have received something of a secondary education as well.

1322. A boy apprenticed to a blacksmith does not get much pay to learn his business, and a boy going into a lawyer's office does not get much pay to learn his profession?—I suppose not.

1323. Why should a pupil-teacher learning his profession expect to receive the pay that he or she has received, and the pay he or she is likely to receive under the proposed scale?—I do not compare the profession of teaching with that of a blacksmith or a lawyer.

1324. Why?—Because you want the best boys for the purpose.

1325. And do you not want the same thing for every profession?—You do for all.

1326. If a boy or girl has a taste for teaching, and desires to make it his or her profession, why should he or she expect to receive considerable remuneration while learning?—I can only say that I presume the reason is that they consider it part of the Government service.

1327. Is there, as a matter of fact, any real reason why pupil-teachers should be so liberally dealt with?—I do not consider that pupil-teachers are unduly liberally dealt with by the scale. In this district pupil-teachers are doing a great deal of work.

1328. Are these pupil-teachers doing too much work, in their own interests?—Certainly.

1329. Is the employment of pupil-teachers in the number that you employ them fair and just to the children of the schools?—I think the Board would gladly avoid it if they could.

1330. Are the pupil-teachers in your district, in your opinion, sufficiently taught, both academically and in the training department?—I do not think there is adequate provision; but I am strongly of opinion that, if possible, pupil-teachers should receive some secondary education before they come into the service.

1331. If they received secondary education, would they not necessarily have to go through some training department?—I would like to see them come from the grammar school, having received one or two years' secondary education there before coming to us.

1332. Have you any acquaintance with the training department of Canterbury?—Twenty years ago I saw it.

1333. Do you know the principle?—Yes.

1334. Knowing that, do you approve it?—It is training with theory and practice combined—yes.

1335. Do you think it advisable that some institution should be established in the various centres to enable pupil-teachers to combine theory and practice, more especially if candidates for employment go through the secondary schools?—Yes. I understand that the training-college exists for those who have gone through their course, and not for those who are entering on it.

1336. *Mr. Hogben.*] Will you furnish the Commission with a statement of the expenditure of the Board for the three years 1898, 1899, and 1900 on such items of administration as are payable out of the capitation grant?—Yes.

1337. It has been suggested that one way of attempting to solve this question might be by giving the Boards increased capitation and leaving to them the power to draw up the scale; do you think that the five districts, Taranaki, Marlborough, Nelson, Grey, and Westland, could construct any scale at all resembling in liberality the proposed colonial scale, which would be higher than any one existing in the colony, or even any fairly liberal scale, such as North Canterbury and Otago?—I do not think so.

1338. It is not even possible for Auckland, as you are aware?—I do not think it is.

1339. Supposing there was a further increase of capitation beyond the 5s., would it not mean that the Boards with a comparatively small number of small schools—Boards whose jurisdiction is over districts that have been settled for a long time—by that extra increase of capitation would be able to do more?—Yes; but I would point out that it would enable them to lay aside some little money for buildings. They need not spend it all on salaries, although they would have the opportunity of doing it.

1340. Would there not be a tendency to spend all the money they got?—I know one district that stored it up, and transferred £10,000 to the Building Fund.

1341. It has been suggested that there are different circumstances in different districts—such as cost of living: do you think in districts where the cost of living is greatest they are in a position at present to pay the highest salaries?—Not necessarily. Westland is a district where the cost of living would be high.

1342. Is it not the case that districts where the cost of living is high are districts where the population is scattered?—The cost of living is not necessarily high. In this district the cost of living is less, possibly, in places most isolated.

1343. To a certain extent it would be so?—Yes.

1344. Has the Auckland Board ever attempted to adjust its scale to the cost of living in the various parts of the district?—No.

1345. Do you think it a practicable thing to attempt to do so?—No.

1346. Is the cost of living in the same district always the same?—No.

1447. The argument of the variation of the cost of living applies to almost any scale you draw up?—It applies to any part of one district compared with another part of the same district.

1348. So that it cannot be regarded as fatal to a colonial scale, as it is common to all scales?—That is so.

1349. In the making of payments, supposing a colonial scale were adopted, it would be necessary for the Boards to send in a claim for salaries. They have to make out salary-sheets like that now in accordance with their own scales?—Yes.

1350. The only difference in this case would be that it would be a calculation in accordance with the colonial scale?—Yes.

1351. Would more work be entailed by the colonial scale?—Yes.

1352. Why?—The Board will have to satisfy the department every month, or every quarter, that a certain sum is payable to its teachers. In this district we would begin to write an abstract, and it would be out of date by the time we got to the end of it, and by the time it reached Wellington the abstract would not be in operation. That is what I chiefly refer to. By the time the money came back we would want something else, because the conditions would have changed.

1353. Would not the same thing happen, to a certain extent, on the capitation we pay you quarter by quarter?—No. The pay-list for two months is never the same, but the capitation remains the same for three months.

1354. If you sent copies of the sheets up to the department, would they not constitute the claim?—Yes; but it would involve considerable adjustment.

1355. They are simply adjustments you would make yourself?—That is quite true.

1356. Do you think the work would have to be done over twice?—The work need not be done twice, because I suppose anything we underclaimed in April we would add to the May claim.

1357. With regard to the necessity for adjustment, do you not think it would be better to base all the claims of the salaries on a year's average and not on a quarter's average?—It would save a good deal of trouble in many ways, but I think individual teachers would experience a little hardship. In a fast-rising district, say, at the end of the first quarter the teacher would feel he was an injured person if he had to continue for nine months at a low rate of pay. What the Board does is to pay the teacher at the end of his first quarter on the average earned by the quarter.

1358. There would have to be provision for certain cases of sudden rise and sudden fall?—Yes.

1359. *The Chairman.*] Are the teachers paid promptly?—Yes.

1360. Do you think they would be paid more promptly under the proposed system?—I suppose the Board would continue to pay, but when the Board would get the claim allowed by the Government I do not know. I do not think the Board under any circumstances would allow the teachers to suffer. The earliest time on which the Board could claim for May would be the 20th May, and it would be impossible for the voucher for that amount to be made out and the money reach here as soon as under the present circumstances.

1361. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you know if there is a truant school in Chapel Street?—It is not called a truant school; it is a school grown out of an institution established for truants.

1362. What of the staffing in that school: is it a liberal staffing, or is the work heavy for the teachers?—In that school an extra assistant is allowed beyond the scale.

1363. Are the teachers in that school harder worked than the teachers in other schools?—I am not aware that such is the case.

1364. Do you know the teacher who has the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards—a Miss Hill?—I know Miss Hill.

1365. She teaches the three standards: what is her salary?—I am not sure whether it is £75 a year or £70.

1366. Do you think that a salary or £75 a year for a person filling that position is sufficient salary?—No, I do not.

1367. What salary do you think she should receive?—I think it should be increased to £80 a year.

1368. Would £80 be sufficient then?—Well, I should like to see a higher salary paid her.

1369. Then, what would be a fair salary for teaching those three standards?—Nearer £90 or £100 a year.

1370. In the preparation of this scale, do you think attention should be given to this case?—Yes; of course, there are precisely other cases of the same sort.

TUESDAY, 4TH JUNE, 1901.

L. J. BAGNALL, Chairman of the Board of Education, examined.

1371. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You are in favour of a colonial scale?—I do not see any objection to it from the Boards' point of view.

1372. Do you think the money could be better distributed by the Board than by the department?—Yes.

1373. Do you think the present system of appointment of teachers is satisfactory?—I do not think it is entirely satisfactory.

1374. Do you think the School Committees have too much power, or too little power?—It depends on the point of view. If you look at it from the point of view of the promotion and proper appointment of teachers, I think the Committees have too much power.

1375. Do you not think that in the establishment of a colonial scale there should be considered the question of the propriety of a system of promotion and classification?—Yes, I think so.

1376. Do you think the half-time schools are a success?—Yes, I think they are necessary in this district and that the work has been fairly satisfactory; in some instances the reports show, where children have passed the standards, that the work is quite up to the average of the full-time schools.

1377. *Mr. Davidson.*] I would like to know from you if you think the teachers in this district are fully satisfied with the salaries paid to them?—I do not think they are, according to what they say, though when vacancies occur there are a great many applicants.

1378. Have you compared the salaries paid to the assistant teachers in Auckland with the salaries paid to teachers holding similar positions in other districts?—Yes, in a general way.

1379. If you take the position of a first male assistant in Auckland and compare the salary paid him with the salary paid an assistant holding a similar position in Otago you find probably a difference of £50 or £60 in favour of the Otago teachers: do you think it fair that a man with equal qualifications, and doing exactly the same work, should be paid so much less?—No, I do not; I think the salaries paid to first assistants are too high even in Auckland.

1380. Do you think the importance of the position of a first male assistant in a school of 600 in attendance does not warrant his receiving a salary of, say, £240?—I do not think so.

1381. Do you not look upon a first male assistant in such a school as occupying a very important and responsible position?—If you judge by the work he does, as compared with the work of the second assistant, no.

1382. Do you not look upon him as a deputy headmaster, who, in the event of the headmaster leaving his position without much notice, would be at once able to take up the headmaster's duties?—He might be able to do so for a short time; I do not think we should contemplate the headmaster being absent.

1383. It is sometimes necessary that a headmaster should leave his duties for a shorter or longer period: do you not think it is wise to have a man as the first assistant master capable of taking up the duties of the headmaster?—No, I do not think so; we have it on record here that a first assistant master was receiving a salary of £200 a year for teaching 27 boys in the Sixth Standard.

1384. Do you not think that, in a case of that sort, it is the fault of the organization of the school and the distribution of the staff?—I do not know that I can give an opinion on that. Speaking generally, and as far as my knowledge goes, I think the second assistants in schools do far harder work than the first assistants.

1385. Do you think the second male assistants in the large schools are very poorly paid?—Yes, they are underpaid.

1386. You pay your teachers in Auckland according to a scale of salary drawn up by the Board, or the Board's officials?—Yes; drawn up by the Board.

1387. The money is received from the department direct, and is distributed by the Board according to its scale?—That is so.

1388. If a uniform scale was drawn up by this Commission and adopted by Parliament, would you not still have the right to distribute the money exactly as you do now, only according to a uniform scale instead of your own special scale?—Yes, as I understand it.

1389. It would not interfere with or curtail the powers of the Board in the matter of the payment of teachers' salaries?—No, not so far as the payment in the scale was concerned; but the Board might think that the scale was not a necessity.

1390. Do you not think we should have a uniform scale of salaries rather than thirteen different scales, such as at present obtain in the colony?—Theoretically, I suppose so; practically, I do not think it would be found to work out satisfactorily.

1391. Why not?—In this district, with regard to the smaller positions, we find that female assistants will remain in Auckland at a salary of £45 a year rather then take a similar position in the country at £70 a year; if you pay the same rate for the same work you will not get teachers to go into the country to take up those positions.

1392. According to this suggested alternative scale, the assistants in the country schools will be paid at a very much higher rate than now, thus making the positions more attractive. In a school between 40 and 90 in average attendance the staffing should be a headmaster and infant mistress. The salary of the infant mistress in a school of 40 to 65 would be £90; in a school of 65 to 90, £100; whereas in the town an assistant low down on the staff would receive from £80 to £85. What is your opinion of that?—If you pay the lowest on the scale £80 or £85 you would not get any one to take the country position at £100.

1393. You think they prefer to remain in town on account of the social and other advantages of city life?—I can only suppose so; I have not friends in the positions. My experience as a member of the Board shows it is difficult to get a female assistant to go into the country.

1394. The reason is not that the salaries are considered so much as the disadvantages?—Yes.

1395. A uniform scale of staff and salaries for the colony would tend to make the positions in the country districts, either of sole teacher or assistant teacher, more attractive, and somewhat remedy the evil you complain of, in so far as it raises the present salaries?—I do not think the proposed scale for the smaller schools is sufficient, especially for the male teachers.

1396. You say you have compared the salaries obtaining in different districts: take a school of an average attendance of 40, the minimum salary would be £160 and the maximum £185—that is considerably better than the salaries paid in Auckland at the present time for similar positions, is it not?—Yes, about £10 a year better. I think a man in charge of a school with 65 children is in a far more responsible position than the first assistant in any of the town schools; he has the responsibility of the whole school, while the assistant master has only the responsibility of the class.

1397. Do you not think that a teacher with an attendance of 65 in a country school would have what would be termed a "rosy" time, seeing that the infant department and lower classes would be taken out of his hands, and he would probably only have an average attendance of about 27, including Standard III. and upwards; and also considering the fact that the salary suggested here is as high, if not higher, than is paid in any part of the colony at the present time?—Schools from 65 in attendance downwards are the most difficult to fill. I do not think people who live in the country should be compelled to take inferior teachers because low salaries are fixed for positions of that kind.

1398. The staffing is more liberal, the salaries are much more liberal, and consequently a better class of teachers is attracted: you approve of that principle?—Yes.

1399. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think that the suggested scale is preferable to the one now in vogue under the Auckland Board?—Yes, so far as the treatment of headmasters is concerned. I do not agree with it as far as the first assistants are concerned.

1400. You think the salaries of the first assistants are too high?—Yes; the persons who get into those positions will not go into the country, but remain in town till they get headmasterships, and, so far as my opinion goes, I think they have a very easy time of it.

1401. You do not think the adoption of a colonial scale and the payment of teachers through the Board would be in any way derogatory to the Board, or deprive it of any of its power or influence?—I do not think so, provided sufficent money is obtained. I think the capitation system is unfair to the Auckland District.

1402. In that case a colonial scale would be much better for the Board itself?—Yes.

1403. *Mr. Luke.*] Mr. Rice mentioned the large number of small schools that had to be provided in the Auckland Education District: do you not think that in building these schools the Auckland Board has done a great deal towards promoting settlement in these outlying districts?—Yes. My experience has been that the Board has met in a very liberal way the demands of the settlers in those districts; and since I have been a member of the Board I do not think any case has been refused where there were a sufficient number of children to warrant the establishment of a school, whether aided or properly constituted.

1404. In regard to the question of incidentals, do you think that the allowances made to School Committees for incidendal expenses are sufficient?—I think they are fairly sufficient; I think the difficulty found is in carrying on the very small schools.

1405. It is sometimes deemed expedient to augment funds by getting up concerts and entertainments, for the purpose of keeping the school buildings and ground in repairs: do you think that state of affairs is desirable?—For improving the grounds, and so forth, I think a little help is desirable.

1406. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider that a colonial scale of staff and salaries adopted by Parliament will have more stability about it than a scale brought into existence by any one of the thirteen Education Boards?—Yes, so far as the salaries are concerned, I suppose so.

1407. Do you consider that salaries should be paid on the average attendance of one quarter, or on the basis of the average attendance for four quarters, so that at the beginning of the year a teacher would know the whole salary he or she would receive for the full period of a year?—I do not think it is very material. I think the teachers would prefer the quarterly average to the annual average basis. It would practically come to the same thing.

1408. You are in favour, as far as possible, of giving fair salaries to country teachers, seeing that there are two-thirds of the schools of the colony with an average attendance of less than 50 pupils?—Yes; for it seems to me that in the country they have to put up with one class of schools, while in the towns they have the advantage of the secondary schools.

1409. Are you in favour of bursaries, exhibitions, and scholarships, whereby the brighter pupils attending the primary schools, the children of the poorer classes, might attend the secondary schools, and continue their higher education in the universities?—Yes.

1410. In the event of a scale of salaries being introduced that will in a few instances prejudicially affect the salaries of some of the teachers, would you postpone its operation in those schools until vacancies occur—that is to say, not make it retrospective?—I think that is a fair thing. It is the practice of this Board.

1411. Do you think that the Legislature should define what the powers and functions of School Committees and Education Boards should be respecting the appointment of teachers?—I think it would be an advantage if their powers were clearly defined.

1412. With regard to the introduction of a colonial scale, you think it would be difficult to introduce a scale that would be equally applicable in every district, on account of the local varying circumstances?—Yes.

1413. With regard to the establishment of small schools, do you find they are a serious drain on the finances of the Auckland Education Board?—Yes.

1414. Do you consider that the Government, out of, say, the amount voted, should subsidise the Boards independently of the ordinary vote, in order to encourage land settlement by providing schools for the children of the pioneer settlers, and giving them facilities for education?—Yes, I think the Government should; it is a matter for consideration as to what fund they take it out of.

1415. *Mr. Hill.*—From your knowledge of local authorities, do you think, supposing we were empowered by Act to give voluntary contributions towards the fostering of education in the respective districts, that such contributions would be likely to be granted?—I do not think local bodies would make grants towards education, if they were able, from local revenue; the revenue is now too small for what they have to do.

1416. In regard to male and female teachers taking country positions, do you find that female teachers are willing to take up those positions as readily as the males?—Not to the same extent; male teachers are more willing to go into the country than female teachers.

1417. Do they get larger salaries than female teachers?—We generally make a difference.

1418. Supposing you offered female teachers the same salaries as you pay males, do you think that would make any difference?—I do not think so. I can quite sympathize with the female teachers who do not want to go into the country districts; the drawbacks and difficulties are so great.

1419. Do you think there should be a closer approximation in the salaries paid to assistant teachers?—Yes, I do. I think there is too great a difference in the salaries paid to assistants at the present time.

1420. You apply the word "assistant" to both male and female teachers, I assume?—Yes. I do not approve of so many female teachers as we have in this district.

1421. Suppose a colonial scale was adopted, would you approve of the choice of male and female teachers being left in the hands of Education Boards rather than stereotyping it, as set forth in the scale?—Yes.

1422. That is, to enable the Boards to adapt the staffing of the schools to the respective needs of the district or districts?—Yes, that is so.

1423. The same staffing would not always apply in the different centres?—No.

1424. Would your Board prefer a colonial scale of salaries rather than receive 5s. extra capitation grant for distribution?—Speaking for myself, I think we would prefer a colonial scale which would give us more money: it is a question of money with us.

1425. Supposing you were offered an extra 10s.?—Then, we would take the 10s.; I do not think a colonial scale of salaries or an increase of 10s. would give us more than was necessary.

1426. Do you think that 11s. 3d. per head, *plus* £250, would suffice for the needs of your Board?—I could hardly say off-hand.

1427. I suppose you find certain new conditions always arising in your district that call for an expenditure not anticipated by the Board here?—Yes.

1428. Will not the limitation of functions in the matter of staffing and salaries materially affect the influence of your Board as the highest authority on primary education in this district?—I do not think it will affect us very much; it will to a certain extent, no doubt.

1429. Your Board does not object to it?—I do not think so. Personally, I think the proposal to increase the number of assistants is much better than the plan we are working under at the present time—*i.e.*, with so many pupil-teachers.

1430. You do not object to a colonial scale so long as it will improve the condition of things in this district?—No.

1431. Do you think that, in the case of teachers who are forced to retire from the service through old age or sickness, some power should be left in the hands of your Board to recommend some

gratuity?—I think it would be better to have some properly arranged system of retiring-allowance, rather than it should be left to a settlement of individual cases.

1432. As Chairman of the Board, will you make a suggestion as to the direction your views take?—I think a proposal to have a scheme that would give an allowance by way of insurance, or by a fund to teachers, in the case of death or inability to carry on through sickness, would be better than leaving it to the fancy of the Boards, which might be too generous or, on the other hand, might not be generous enough.

1433. You think a scheme of superannuation would be preferable?—Yes.

1434. Do you think that the teachers would be willing that a certain amount should be deducted from their salaries for the purpose of establishing such a scheme?—I am not at all sure that the teachers would favour such a scheme; a great many would, but I could not speak for the whole of them.

1435. *The Chairman.*] Have you had much difficulty in getting vacancies filled in this district?—No; we always have a fair number of applicants.

1436. For what positions do you receive the greatest number of applications?—For headmasterships in schools; positions carrying a salary of over £200.

1437. Do you get as many applications for country vacancies as for town vacancies?—No; the country vacancies are harder to fill. The applications for these vacancies are more limited than in the case of vacancies in the towns.

1438. Is there any difference in the standard of quality of teachers who apply for situations in the towns and those who apply for situations in the country?—Sometimes we have the same teacher applying for both positions.

1439. Do you get equally efficient teachers to apply for both positions?—The more qualified teachers, as a rule, do not apply to go into the country.

1440. In regard to vacancies carrying salaries of over £200 a year, you say you get plenty of applications for positions of that kind?—Yes; we advertise. The other day for a situation of that sort we received thirty-eight applications; that was at Tauranga.

1441. Were they chiefly applications from the Auckland District?—Yes; there were only two outside applications, and they were received too late.

1442. Was that for an assistantship position?—No; a headmastership.

1443. In view of the facts you have mentioned, some of the salaries paid in this district are very inadequate when compared to others?—Yes, I have indicated that in this district such a state of things applies, particularly to that class of schools with an average attendance of 60, and under; they are very underpaid.

1444. You think they require building up?—Yes, I do.

1445. Do you think any great cruelty would ensue if positions carrying salaries of from £200 to £250 and upwards were left alone and the smaller salaries built up?—No, I do not think so; I think there should be good salaries paid in the larger schools; I do not believe in cutting salaries down.

1446. I suppose the teachers in the larger schools, and who receive salaries of over £200, complain, like others, that they are not paid sufficiently?—Yes, I think some of them do.

1447. Do you think that if they were paid half as much again that that complaint would disappear?—It should do so; still, I doubt that it would disappear altogether. One of the greatest causes of complaint in this district has been the question of teachers' residences—the fact that some are provided and some are not. The scale of salaries is the same; it works unfairly in some instances.

1448. What is your opinion about residences and house allowance: do you think the question of such should be included in the scale or not—should some have house allowance and others none?—I think in the case of a married man in charge of a school, if there is no residence, he should receive house allowance.

1449. If teachers were allowed to provide their own residences out of the salaries paid them, do you think it would remove inequalities and grievances that exist?—That was tried in Auckland and there was very much grumbling at having to pay rent. I think it would be more satisfactory to pay a salary and give a house in. It should be at least taken into account.

1450. Would that not involve the construction of a great number of houses that might afterwards become a burden to look after?—Yes; we have some cases at the present time where the houses are not occupied; not very many though. At all events, where there is no house provided, house allowance should be paid.

1451. It is stated that there is a feeling of dissatisfaction and unrest among the teachers in Auckland: is it because they have lost confidence in the administration of their Board?—I do not think that there is a great feeling of unrest among the Auckland teachers; I think it is very much magnified.

1452. Has the Board made many changes in its scale of salaries?—No, very few; and what changes have been made have been in the direction of increasing the salaries, except in October last, when some of them were reduced and others were raised.

1453. Those who were reduced have only suffered the reduction for three months?—Yes.

1454. What was the object of the alteration: was it made with a view of improving the weak salaries at the expense of the strong ones; in other words, deducting from the larger salaries to add to the smaller ones?—Yes; about £700 was deducted and about £800 was added to those in receipt of low salaries. We had instances of married men in schools receiving only £80 a year.

1455. Then, I suppose you do not think that any serious injustice was done to the teaching profession in this district?—No; though I was sorry we were compelled to make this particular reduction.

1456. I suppose I can assume that the Board has not been apathetic in regard to the treatment of teachers in this district, seeing that they have done the best they could with the money available?—Yes; I think the Board has been most careful of the interests of the teachers.

1457. When vacancies occur are applications invariably invited?—Always for the larger schools carrying salaries from £140 or £150 upwards.

1458. How are the vacancies filled in connection with the smaller schools?—The names of teachers who are considered suitable for the position are gone over, and a list drawn out and submitted to the Inspector, and he recommends whom he thinks most suitable for the position. If there are three or four names they are sent to the Committee; these are deemed the most suitable and the most deserving of promotion.

1459. In that case must the teachers apply, or do you simply select any teacher whom you may think fit?—Very often they apply themselves if they know there is a vacancy. In every case notes are sent to them asking if they wish to have their names sent up.

1460. Then, the Committee makes a selection and the Board confirms it?—Yes.

1461. Does the Board reserve to itself the right of rejecting the selection at any time?—Yes, if the Committees select from other than the names sent up by the Board.

1462. In the case of the better class of vacancies, where you receive applications, does the Board deal with the applications or the Committee?—The Board deals with them in the first instance, after consultation with the Inspector or Inspectors, and then recommends such names to be sent up to the Committee as they think proper.

1463. Do you send a complete list of the applicants' names to the Committee?—Not as a rule; just a certain number.

1464. The Committee is allowed to make the final selection?—Yes.

1465. Have you heard any complaints of dissatisfaction regarding this mode of making appointments?—Yes, sometimes; teachers are sometimes dissatisfied that their names are not included among those forwarded; and the Committees, on the other hand, often complain that the name of the person they want is not sent.

1466. Do you know whether the teachers are in the habit of canvassing members of Committees in order to secure promotion?—No; but I do not think that is the case; the Board discountenances anything of that nature.

1467. Do you not think it would be better if the Board made the appointments itself?—Yes, I think, generally speaking, it would be better.

1468. Does your Board ever make transfers from one school to another—that is, supposing the attendance in a certain school falls, and the teacher's salary is larger than the Board can afford to pay for the size of the school; in such a case would the Board arrange for a transfer?—We find that is a very difficult thing to do. Committees object very strongly to such a course. The Committees of the larger schools think that all vacancies of that kind should be advertised, and so do the teachers. We have had repeated protests from the Teachers' Institute for not advertising certain positions.

1469. Assuming that a colonial scale of salaries is agreed upon, and passed by Parliament, do you think that the teachers in districts where the cost of living is comparatively high will be satisfied to receive the same salaries and no more than teachers in other localities where the cost of living is less?—I think that will cause a great deal of dissatisfaction.

1470. You think there would be an outcry from the teachers?—Yes. I think it is the weak point in the colonial scale.

1471. While there may be an equality of pay, there is not likely to be an equality of sacrifice?—That is so.

1472. Do you think that a hard-and-fast colonial scale in a country like New Zealand, where the climate and other conditions are so different, would be likely to prove a bigger success than other administration?—I do not think so.

1473. The conditions are always varying, you say?—Yes.

1474. You do not think that those conditions will be met by a colonial scale such as is proposed?—No, I do not think so.

1475. If considerably more money in the shape of an increased capitation grant was given—say, 10s. *per capita*—to the Education Board, do you think that the claims of the teachers would be fully satisfied?—I believe so—for the Auckland District, at any rate.

1476. And you think you would have enough money for Committees' incidental expenses?—Yes, I think so.

D. Petrie, M.A., Chief Inspector to the Education Board, examined.

Mr. Petrie: I think the scale of salaries proposed in this suggested scheme does not provide sufficient remuneration for the teachers of the larger schools. The best class of young men will not be attracted into the ranks of the teaching profession unless better prizes are offered. I am decidedly of the opinion that the remuneration given to the headmasters of the larger schools should be considerably increased. I also think that the scale of payments for first assistants is out of all proportion with the work they do, when compared with the work of certain other teachers and the remuneration they receive. In a school with an average attendance of from 570 to 600 the average number of pupils per unit of staff is 39; suppose a first assistant teaches 39, it is proposed he should be paid £220. Now, I consider that a headmaster who teaches a school of 35 pupils, with all standards, has much more arduous and difficult work to perform than has the first assistant I mentioned; yet the pay of the one—the head-teacher of the small school of 35—is more than one-third less than the pay of the other, though the work of the former requires a greater degree of skill. Touching the lower assistants in the larger schools, I think it would be a good plan to equalise their payment. Any headmaster knows that he may have a second assistant who cannot be put in the position a

second assistant should take, and he may have to put a fifth assistant to do the work of the second assistant; indeed, you will hardly find a large school in which the lower assistants are not in some cases doing the work of the higher assistants. In recommending to the Commission the advisability of adopting nearly equal salaries in the case of the lower assistants in the larger schools, I think it should especially apply to the lower three assistants; I would not put them on an equality, but would reduce very greatly the differences which exist at the present time. With regard to pupil-teachers, in my opinion schools with an average attendance of from 35 to 50 are the class of schools in which a young pupil-teacher can be most efficiently and effectively employed. I would rather see every such school staffed with a headmaster and a pupil-teacher than with a headmaster and an assistant teacher, for I think it would be more economical, and practically as efficient. Schools with attendances of from 35 to 50 are usually small buildings of one room—in some cases perhaps only half the size of this room we are in; and I do not think it would be wise, nor in the interests of the children's education, to have two teachers, one a head-teacher and the other an assistant teacher, working in the same room, where they would make a great deal of noise that would mar the efficiency of the instruction. I do not think they would pull together so well as a head-teacher and a pupil-teacher, and this opinion is shared by several of my colleagues to whom I have spoken on the subject. With regard to the position of the infant mistress, I am afraid that perhaps I do not quite understand the intention of this scale as to the duties and position of this member of the staff. I take it that an infant mistress would differ from an ordinary assistant in some manner, probably by being placed in authority over some of the other assistants. I think that is a very undesirable feature to introduce into the management of a school; it is setting up a sort of *quasi*-head-teacher under the responsible head-teacher. I think it is unnecessary to apply to her the title of infant mistress; if she is paid and treated as other assistant teachers it will answer all cases in all schools. The plan of alternating male and female teachers in the scale is no doubt introduced for economical reasons—I cannot imagine any other reasons that can be adduced in support of the proposal. It is certain that Standards IV., V., and VI., in the great majority of cases, are much more efficiently taught by males than by females, and therefore it is very desirable that these standards should be taught in future by male teachers. If male and female assistants are to alternate it means that the female assistant will often be set to do the work of a lower assistant, while a lower assistant will be placed above her, doing much higher work; that seems to me a very objectionable arrangement. If a second male teacher is required I should make him second male assistant, and the third male, third male assistant, and so on. With regard to the proposed increase of staff, I think the staffing is very liberal, especially in the larger schools, from 300 in attendance upwards. An undue increase of the staff will in some cases lead to considerable difficulty. We have in the Auckland District schools conducted in a single schoolroom with attendances of 120, or at least over 100, and the staffing in a school of over 100 in attendance, according to the proposed scale, consists of four members. It would be the height of absurdity to have four teachers in one room.

Mr. Hogben: I might point out that there are three under the alternative scale.

Mr. Petrie: I have not had time to study the alternative scale. I think that in many of the schools in Auckland, and in the other district with which I am acquainted—Otago—it would be needful to enlarge the schoolrooms and subdivide them, in order to avoid the friction caused by two or three teachers working in the same room. It will be a matter for special inquiry to learn how far this difficulty will arise, but that it will arise in some cases I am sure; whether it will arise widely I cannot say offhand. I think that the salaries proposed to be paid to female teachers under the scale are altogether beyond what both the Treasury and the community can afford to pay for their services. I should fix the maximum salary for female teachers at £150—a fair maximum salary for any position a woman could fill in any of the public schools of the colony. We can afford to pay female teachers the same remuneration as they would get in other positions; and if we do that it seems to me we are doing justice to them. I think if a comparison is made it will be found that very few women in other positions in life gain such salaries as are here proposed. The reason for paying female teachers so much less than male teachers arises out of the nature and aims of female life, and the fact that headmasters are generally married men who have to bring up families, so that we must make their permanent positions such as they can look forward to with satisfaction and certainty for the future. If we are going to spend a large portion of the salary fund in the payment of high salaries to female teachers, I think the income of the married teachers will be reduced to such an extent that they will be unable to look forward to a position of comfort, such as they should have the right to. I think, in fixing the salaries of female teachers, there should be a reasonable gradation between the minimum and the maximum. I do not know how far the proposed scale of staffing will lead to the separation of boys and girls for instruction in the larger schools. I think it is a very good thing in every way to have boys and girls taught together, even in the upper standards in the large schools, for the common school-life does a great deal of good, and I am convinced it tends to minimise the evil that is likely to crop up if we separate them. The proposal to deduct from the head-teachers of schools with an average attendance between 19 and 35 £10 for a sewing-mistress seems to me a little unjust. Special provision should be made for that post. I do not think it is always wise that the headmaster's wife should be preferred for the position. I am sure a headmaster would generally be consulting his own interest if he said to his wife, "I prefer that you should not take this position of sewing-mistress." With regard to rent allowance, of course rent allowance cannot form part of a scale of salaries, but it seems to me that a rent allowance is a necessary supplement to this scheme. The reason why residences should be provided for teachers is principally because teachers could not get suitable houses convenient to the schools in the great majority of cases, and especially in the case of country schools do I think it imperative that dwellinghouses should be provided for head-teachers. Of

course, in the towns and cities houses can be rented easily. As a matter of fact, throughout the colony, probably three-fourths, certainly two-thirds, of the headmasters of schools are already provided with dwellinghouses, and in the interval, until dwellinghouses are provided for the remainder, I think they should be given a rent allowance; nothing else would meet the case.

1477. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Regarding the question of teachers' residences in the towns, would it not be just as well to give an extra allowance to provide house-rent, instead of erecting houses where there are no houses at the present time?—I think it does not matter which is done, so long as they have a house allowance failing a house.

1478. Do you not think it often occurs that in the case of a married man with a large family he will want a large house, and at other times the teacher may be a bachelor?—Yes, that is a real difficulty. It often happens that in the case of a man with a large family it is, for this reason, inconvenient to move him, even to a better position.

1479. Do you favour a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes; it would secure more completely a uniform payment for the same service, and for that reason I prefer it.

1480. Do you think that the Inspectors should be under the control of the central department?—I prefer not to answer that question.

1481. You may have noticed from returns that the grades of teachers have been increased in some parts of the colony to a greater extent than in other parts. In Nelson, Grey, Westland, and Wellington, for instance, they have been increased from 28 to 32 per cent: how many have been increased in this provincial district within the last twelve months—increasing the promotion of teachers from class to class?—I am not in a position to say positively; I do not think there are more than twenty or thirty promotions a year in this district.

1482. In Otago I see only one teacher was promoted in 1898, and one in Canterbury in 1900: if a colonial scale is adopted, might not these increases or promotions in regard to teachers weigh unduly in favour of teachers in districts where such promotions are more easily obtained?—Yes, it might be so. I think the difficulty of securing equitable promotion in different districts is an ineradicable evil of the system.

1483. The point I wish to ask is, should the department make arrangements to enable teachers to obtain C certificates by taking examinations for Class C in sections?—Yes; I should not object to that. I think that a reasonable proposal.

1484. Would that not be a great aid to country teachers?—Yes, I think it would be.

1485. Regarding the half-time schools you have here, are the results from those half-time schools nearly as good as the results from the full-time schools?—We have a large number of half-time schools in which the results are quite as good; but, on the other hand, we have a considerable number in which the results are not so good; it depends on the teacher carrying on the school. I am satisfied that the working of half-time schools involves no hardship in sparsely settled rural districts; if pupils are to be kept away from school for a part of their time they may be kept away on the days the half-time schools are closed, and after all put in the same number of attendances as they would have made had the schools been full time. I think that up to an average of 18 or 20 pupils in each school half-time schools may be worked in a satisfactory manner in this district on the six half-days during which each is open.

1486. Do the teachers take exception to working six days?—I am not sufficiently in the confidence of the teachers to say; I have never heard of any complaints. I am sure it involves hardships at times in the case of lady teachers, though sometimes a teacher in a very quiet district may rather welcome some regular work on Saturdays.

1487. Have you itinerant teachers in this provincial district?—Two or three.

1488. You are aware that in some of the educational districts of New Zealand there are a great number of schools established for the benefit of a very few children?—Yes.

1489. Do you think it would be possible to extend the principle of itinerant teachers?—No, I do not think so.

1490. Say, in the case of schools established for 3, 4, or 5 children, as in the Sounds?—There are very few cases like that in Auckland, so far as my knowledge allows me to say.

1491. *Mr. Davidson.*] You will notice in the first proposed scale that the first assistance proposed to be granted to a teacher is in a school with an average attendance of 36, and in the alternative scale the attendance must reach 40 before the assistance is granted?—Yes.

1492. In your opinion, is a sole teacher capable of managing efficiently a school up to 40 in average attendance?—No; it is a question of degree. I think a teacher who has 35 pupils with all standards has a fair school to manage. With 5 or 6 in each class, 40 would be about the average. I think such a number might be taught by one teacher, and I recommended the Board of Education here to adopt that scale; on the other hand, I am of the opinion that if assistance can be afforded at 35 it should be given.

1493. From your experience you know that assistance is not given in Otago until the attendance reaches 50?—Yes; but I believe a monitor is allowed.

1494. A monitor is allowed between 40 and 50; so that the staffing under the suggested scale is more liberal than that which is allowed in Otago, is it not?—Yes.

1495. You are of the opinion that a pupil-teacher should be appointed in schools between 35 and 50 in average attendance?—Yes.

1496. Do you prefer that the assistance should take the form of a pupil-teacher between 35 and 50, rather than the form of a certificated assistant between 40 and 90?—I think it would be better to retain 36 as the number at which assistance should be allowed, and from 37 to 50 to add a pupil-teacher; thereafter the best staffing would be a headmaster and an assistant teacher.

1497. Do you not think that there are too many pupil-teachers employed?—I have no doubt there are at the present time.

1498. If you could get rid of the necessity of appointing pupil-teachers in schools between 35 and 50 you would diminish the number of pupil-teachers by a very large extent; but if you did not

do so, seeing that there are 238 schools in the colony with an average attendance between 35 and 50, it would mean a very large increase of pupil-teachers, would it not?—Yes, that would necessarily mean an increase in the number of pupil-teachers in smaller schools; but it would be balanced, I think, by the remodelling of the pupil-teacher staff allowed in the higher classes of schools; a majority of them would be attached to one type of school.

1499. Would you appoint a first-year pupil-teacher to such schools?—Yes, after some practice, and if they were approved by persons competent to judge.

1500. If the available funds would admit of the appointment of an assistant teacher at 40, do you not think that a teacher would prefer to teach an increased number, say 4 or 5, and have a certificated teacher to help him, rather than have the tuition and instruction of a pupil-teacher in addition to his ordinary work?—As I said before, I cannot answer for teachers' preferences; I think the teachers should be asked that question. I know that when it was proposed to make a sole teacher teach 40 pupils, as against the old maximum of 35 pupils, the teachers brought a great deal of pressure to bear on the Auckland Board to fix the number at 35; that evidently shows their predilection. I cannot answer the question in any other way.

1501. Do you not consider that the first male assistant should be looked upon as a deputy headmaster?—No, I do not. I think the cases in which the headmaster would be absent would be emergency cases, would be rare, and to provide a constant substitute for these cases seems to me to be unnecessary.

1502. Do you think the salaries paid to the first male assistants are too high?—I do not object to the salaries paid them on the score of their being too high; I say they are too high relatively to the salaries paid to other teachers who do equally hard and important work. I should like to see the salaries of these other teachers increased in proportion. I consider the second male assistant's work, and the demands made on him, are little inferior to the work of and the demands made on the first male assistant.

1503. Do you find that the best class of boys are willing to enter the teaching profession?—I am sorry to say that we do not find the best class of boys willing to become pupil-teachers.

1504. What, in your opinion, is the cause of that?—I have no doubt there are many contributing causes. There are schools from which we get a number of promising boys, and in those schools the work of a teacher is looked up to and respected; but in many other schools I do not think that is the case. From the latter we get few male candidates. No doubt the chances of rising to better positions if they become successful are fewer than in other employments and professions.

1505. You object to the term "infant mistress" being applied to the first female assistant in schools where assistants are employed?—Not so much to the term as to the implied position; introducing her at this particular stage in the scale seems to me to be creating a sort of second head-teacher's position, or a parallel position; that she should be specially placed in authority over other assistants is, I think, undesirable.

1506. I understand that you object to the alternating of male and female assistants?—Except economical reasons, I see nothing to recommend the proposal.

1507. You are of opinion that in large schools where Standards IV., V., and VI. average an attendance of 60 and over, those standards should be in charge of male teachers?—As a rule, yes. I have seen women who manage these classes very efficiently, but they are rare.

1508. Do you think that the average woman is physically incapable of managing such large classes?—I should like to say that both in Otago and here I have met with but a limited number of female teachers who could manage those classes successfully. I am of the opinion that the average female teacher cannot.

1509. Do you not think that an exceptional woman would suffer in health on account of the strain?—We have applications for leave of absence on account of illness from them at times.

1510. In what class of schools do you consider the staffing is too liberal?—I think you might say in schools with an attendance of from 300 upwards. I should not object to this staffing provided it fits the school-buildings now provided; I should, however, object to it if it involved the reconstruction of school-buildings, and I think it quite possible that in some cases it would involve reconstruction.

1511. Do you consider that the small schools having an attendance of under 30 should be in charge of female teachers, where the district is suitable for the employment of a female teacher?—I do not think there is any particular reason for preferring female to male teachers in such schools, except, perhaps, the one ground of economy.

1512. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think, as time goes on, a very large number of teachers become incapacitated through age, and are thus rendered unfit to carry on school-work?—No doubt that is the case.

1513. Do you think those cases cause difficulty to the Boards under which the teachers work?—Yes; in certain cases.

1513. You think that tendency is becoming greater every year?—I think so.

1514. Do you think, in the public interest, that there should be some contributing system arranged, by means of which these teachers could be removed from their schools when they became too old?—Yes; I think that is very desirable.

1515. That would be impossible, would it not, under the present system of payment by different scales throughout the colony?—I do not know; it may be impossible, on the ground that Committees have to be consulted. I do not think the different payments obtaining in different parts of the colony need make it impossible.

1516. Do you not think it impossible with thirteen different scales of payment?—Such a state of things might make the initial difficulties greater.

1517. Supposing we had a colonial scale, it would be easier for the Government to arrange a contributing scheme, would it not?—Yes.

1518. The actuarial difficulties would be easier dealt with?—Yes.

1519. Do you think that the teachers in this district are satisfied with the present state of affairs in regard to remuneration?—I really am not able to say.

1520. The teachers have not complained to you?—I have never heard complaints; it is quite possible they may be dissatisfied without my hearing of it.

1521. Do you think that there are too many small schools in this provincial district?—I do not think so. When I came to the Auckland District I understood there was an undue multiplication of schools; but I am of the opinion that that evil is not more prevalent here than in Otago. There are not more than three or four cases in which the schools are more numerous than need be.

1522. Do you think there are special difficulties in overtaking settlement?—A special difficulty is that the very small schools form an unusually high proportion of the total number of schools, and the difficulty in that way is very grave.

1523. Do you think that increasing settlement must lead to an increasing number of small schools?—Yes. I should say that the number of small schools to be provided every year would be about eight or ten for some time to come; the number has not been quite so great as that in the past two years.

1524. In point of fact, you think that a colonial scale would have the indirect result of compelling the colony to face the question of education as its settlement extended?—Yes; and it would be an advantage too.

1525. *Mr. Luke.*] You are in favour of a colonial scale?—I think it would be a just thing in the interests of the teachers of the colony.

1526. Do you think it would improve the financial condition of the Auckland Education District?—I am not sure of that; I feel it would improve the position of the teachers under the Auckland Education Board.

1527. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you find that in the small country schools the female teachers do the work just as efficiently as the male teachers in similar types of schools?—Yes; on the whole, that is so.

1528. Do you also find that in the lower classes, up to Standard IV., and possibly including Standard IV., that female teachers can discharge their duties as efficiently as male teachers?—Yes; in those positions female teachers do quite as well as male teachers, and sometimes better. Of course, it must be borne in mind that the male teachers occupying the positions to which you refer are inexperienced when compared with the female teachers.

1529. In those cases would you favour equal payment to female teachers—that is, pay them the same salaries as males are paid, seeing that they do as good work?—No, I would not. I think the male is the head of the family, and a woman is not; at least, as soon as she becomes the head of the family she is practically unfit to be a teacher.

1530. Then, you base your conclusions rather on the responsibility that the male has to bear in society?—Yes, on social reasons, not reasons of efficiency as a teacher at all.

1531. I think you alleged that females could not in other walks and avocations of life command the same salaries as they could in schools—or, at all events, not greater?—What I meant was that we should give them equal and perhaps better salaries than they would be able to secure in other walks of life.

1532. That is looking on the teaching profession as more lucrative than dressmaking, millinery, or work in the Telephone Exchange?—Yes; at dressmaking I suppose they would not get more than 17s. 6d. or £1 per week.

1533. Are there not dressmakers in Auckland earning £6 a week?—It becomes an art then.

1534. With regard to the minimum certificates required in the proposed or suggested scale, do you consider that those suggested minimum certificates are too high?—No, I do not. The rebate proposed to be taken off is not very high, and I look upon it as a stimulus to teachers; if they fail, the fine is nothing very serious.

1535. Do you consider, judging from your long and varied experience, that the syllabus requires too much work on the part of country teachers?—Yes, I think the syllabus is overcrowded from the point of view of every class of school.

1536. Would you favour differentiation in the work required as between town and country schools?—No, I should not favour introducing a different standard of work; I would favour introducing a difference in the extent of study, though I think the standard of work should be the same in both cases.

1537. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you approve of the classification of teachers as set forth in the scale?—I have not considered the matter fully; it is a point I have somewhat overlooked. As long as there is a moderate fine imposed, I think it is desirable to keep the classification for different positions as high as may be.

1538. Do you approve of the present mode of classifying teachers?—I think it could be improved.

1539. Do you find, for example, that A1 and B1 men are better than C1 or D1 men in the control of schools?—It is hard to say; we have so few A1 and B1 men that it is difficult to make a comparison. My feeling is that efficiency in teaching, after a certain width of education is secured, should override other considerations; after a certain point, say rank C, technical skill should count for more than distinction by examination.

1540. The ordinary literary qualifications of men possessing a D certificate, you think, are ample, even for the large schools here?—I think it is desirable that for the large schools there should be head-teachers of Class C.

1541. Is it absolutely necessary?—As I said, expecting a high classification will act as a stimulus. To obtain a school of an attendance of 300, a teacher need not necessarily

have a C certificate; but he will be fined if he has not, and therefore it is an incentive for him to work up and obtain the required certificate.

1542. Should not a matter like that be left to the judgment of the Education Boards?—It might create difficulties at times to lay down a hard-and-fast rule, and would sometimes exclude very desirable candidates; I have had experience of that in this district.

1543. What is your idea, your opinion, as to the desirability of the assistants in large schools taking part in the instruction of the pupil-teachers of that school?—I think it is desirable and very fair.

1544. Suppose such was required under a colonial scale, do you think it would be a fair proceeding that instruction for the pupil-teachers should be required from them in the same manner as instruction for the children is required, and that the remuneration for the work would come in as part of their salaries?—I should not say it is desirable to require all the assistants to give that instruction; I think those assistants might give help who are fitted to do so.

1545. The headmaster, naturally being responsible, would give the subject best fitted for a certain teacher?—Yes.

1546. Do you think that plan would work well in this district?—Yes, it works now in this district.

1547. What do you think should be the maximum size of a public school on the average?—From 750 to 800, I should say.

1548. Why would you go as high as that?—Because I think an efficient headmaster could effectively supervise such a school. The larger a school the greater the economy in management.

1549. Do you not think the classes would duplicate before that number was reached?—No doubt.

1550. Then would it not be better to draw a line before the duplication commences?—I do not see any objection to duplicating classes at certain stages. Even in smaller schools than those with an attendance of 700 or 800 duplication is often necessary

1551. According to that there is no objection to those large schools in Christchurch where the sexes are separated. Do you approve of that principle?—No.

1552. That is done in consequence of the duplication?—No doubt.

1553. You spoke of the staffing in a school between 35 and 50, and in your opinion you suggested a pupil-teacher would be better than an assistant. Do you mean an ex-pupil-teacher?—No; I mean an ordinary pupil-teacher.

1554. One to be trained by the head-teacher?—Yes.

1555. Would you place a first-year pupil-teacher to render help in such a school as that?—Yes, I would. I do not see why a pupil-teacher should not give very useful assistance in such a school.

1556. To take 20 children below Standard II.?—I would not allow a pupil-teacher to be told off to take exclusively any particular class of that kind. The pupil-teacher would take part in the teaching of the lower classes mainly, and in the routine work. The head-teacher would take a share in teaching them as well.

1557. Would you have a male teacher in such a school?—I would not object to a male teacher in that class of school.

1558. And a female pupil-teacher?—Yes; I do not see any disadvantage.

1559. You think such an arrangement would work well?—It has worked well in the past, and I do not despair of its working in the future.

1560. Suppose in schools with an attendance below 35, a regulation was made to the effect that female teachers should be employed, in your opinion would that be an advantage or a disadvantage?—I think it would be foolishness to lay down any rule of that kind; the selection for an appointment would depend largely on circumstances.

1561. Would you limit small country schools to female teachers?—Certainly not. There are many districts where it would be unfair to send female teachers—rough, out-of-the-way, roadless districts—and young men should be sent there on that account.

1562. Do the residents in those districts give any aid to the schools?—Yes; there are certain schools with a capitation grant of £4 or £5 paid by the Board, and the people find the teacher, and supplement the salary, at all events in theory.

1563 Then you would not limit the control of those small schools to female teachers?—No; I do not think it would be advisable to make a rule that female teachers only should have the control of schools with an attendance below 25. No doubt in the majority of cases female teachers do get those schools.

1564. Supposing you sent a female teacher to take charge of a school where formerly a male teacher had been in charge, do you think the female should receive the same salary as the male was getting, or a smaller salary?—I think she should receive nearly an equal salary. In cases of that kind I think the salaries of female teachers may be more justly approximated to those of males than in any other cases that you could mention.

1565. Would you expect the same results from that female teacher as you would from the male?—Yes.

1566. Then why should she not receive the same salary if that is the case?—I have already explained that the reasons rest on social and family considerations.

1567. *Mr. Weston.*] How many buildings in your district do you think would have either to be enlarged or altered upon the introduction of such a scheme as is suggested?—I really am not able to answer that question off-hand. I am of the opinion that it would be necessary to make alterations in a good many cases. This Board's policy once was to have large class-rooms, capable

of holding 80 children; and it would be impossible to have three teachers working efficiently together in that one room. In small schools, if an assistant was granted at 35, we should need to put up another room in many cases. I think it is undesirable that even two teachers should be teaching side by side.

1568. Do you think that too many pupil-teachers are employed in this district?—I have no doubt it is so throughout the colony.

1569. Do you think that not alone are the children attending the school prejudiced, but that the pupil-teachers are also prejudiced by their daily work in the schools?—The hardest lot of any teacher under this Board is that of the pupil-teacher. I should like to see their work lightened, and also to see them better paid than they are at the present time.

1570. Do you think that pupil-teachers' time should be divided between study and practice?—I should like to see their work restricted to four hours teaching each day, and the rest of their time made available for study.

1571. You say that you think pupil-teachers should be better paid?—Well, I think perhaps they are fairly paid; they are rather over-worked than under-paid.

1572. It has been urged that pupil-teachers should receive higher payment; has it occurred to you that they are learning a profession, and that the moderate pay they receive might be held sufficient?—Yes.

1573. It has occurred to you?—Yes, if they are placed in efficient schools they learn a good deal, or should do. Their training is a real supplement to their payment.

1574. In regard to the difficulty in obtaining boys as pupil-teachers, do you think that the hard grind that a pupil-teacher undertakes enters into the consideration of a boy when he rejects pupil-teaching?—I doubt if boys actually realise this as a man would; still something operates on the mind of the boy, and it may as well be that as anything else. I think the disposition of young lads towards the teaching profession depends upon the impression made upon them by the head-teacher of the school at which they have been trained; if the impression the boy has of the head-master be a favourable one, he is more likely to take up the teaching profession, but if, on the other hand, it be unfavourable, then he will not think of entering it.

1575. Do you think there should be a differentiation of the syllabus as regards the country schools?—Yes; I think the course of study in the country schools should not be so extensive.

1575A. You mean to say that some of the subjects should be eliminated?—That, in part; I think relief could also be given by adopting a simpler course.

1576. I suppose if manual instruction be embodied in the syllabus, a very material alteration will have to be made?—Yes.

1577. Do you think that a material alteration in the present subjects, to introduce technical and manual instruction, would be an advantage to the colony as a whole?—I can only offer a theoretical opinion, and my theoretical view of the case is this: the utility and educational value of manual training are at the present time not proved.

1578. With regard to relieving-teachers, is there any necessity in this district, so far as you are aware, for appointing special relieving-teachers? On the other hand, are there enough teachers awaiting employment to take up relieving work?—Yes, I think there is need in a district like this to keep a small number of relieving-teachers—two or three. We sometimes need additional relieving-teachers to provide for emergencies that could not be overtaken by two permanent relieving-teachers. I think we could constantly employ two or three extra. In this district we have very frequent applications for leave of absence owing to ill-health. Doctors are very acute now-a-days in detecting symptoms of ill-health, and prompt in advising change of scene, &c. It is partly due to the enervating climate, I suppose. We have no reserve of unemployed teachers to fall back on for relieving work.

1579. Then, the more relieving-teachers you have the more applications you also receive for leave of absence?—That may be so.

1580. Do you think that pupil-teachers in this district should receive a sound and efficient education in order to qualify themselves for the positions they may be called upon to fill?—I think there should be some means provided for their further education, and for improving their professional skill, such as the establishment of a training-college.

1581. What action do you think the Government should take in the matter?—They should establish a suitably equipped training-college.

1582. *Mr. Hogben.*] In regard to the question of the utility of manual training, I think you said your opinion was mainly based on theory?—I did say so.

1583. Did you read the report of the Irish Commission?—I read the final report, not the full report; the final report does not contain the evidence.

1584. You are aware that they took the evidence of a large number of witnesses, and sent their own Commissioners to visit different countries where manual and technical instruction was adopted?—Yes; the names of the witnesses examined are mentioned in the report; that is all that I know.

1585. The fifth volume?—I suppose so.

1586. You are aware that their report, though drawn up in many terms, is distinctly in favour of the adoption of manual training?—Yes. The highest authorities in England, so far as I am aware, express uncertainty about the value and organization of manual training, and point out that without co-ordination it is of little use—manual and technical training without co-ordination.

1587. But those remarks of yours you would not apply *with* co-ordination?—No; whether manual training is deserving of wholesale adoption is a point I feel very doubtful about.

1588. You propose to introduce a pupil-teacher as the first assistance a head-teacher should get; in what schools do you think a pupil-teacher should get the best training—in large or small schools?—With an efficient head-teacher I think a pupil-teacher would get as good a training in a small school as in a large school.

1589. Do you think that the head-teacher of a small school could spare the time to supervise a pupil-teacher?—It would not take up much time. I hardly know what special supervision a pupil-teacher would want; he watches the headmaster and picks up the methods he sees applied—it is mainly a matter of imitation. He would have instruction on method chiefly outside teaching hours.

1590. Do you think it is in the interests of the children that you should give the first help to the head-teacher in the form of a pupil-teacher?—I do not think the children would seriously suffer by it. As I said before, there would be friction caused by two teachers talking one against the other in a small room—that is an assistant teacher and a head-teacher—and that friction, I think, would be lessened in the case of a pupil-teacher and a head-teacher.

1591. If the State was prepared to grant an extra amount to alter the school buildings do you not think, in that case, it would be better to have an assistant?—It would then depend on the quality of the assistant; we have many inexperienced assistants who do not do any better work than pupil-teachers. The assistants in such schools would be of the lowest class, and receive the minimum pay.

1592. On the average are not assistants better?—I do not think they would do much better work in country schools; the average assistant in a small school is not much better than a pupil-teacher; of course there are cases where assistants are better.

1593. Would a salary of £90 a year secure a good assistant?—Perhaps. I think it is better to employ pupil-teachers in schools of that class than in larger schools. Control is easier; the classes are much smaller and more easily managed. There is much routine work that they never do well.

1594. *The Chairman.*] From what you have just stated you are of the opinion that the sudden transition from a small school with one teacher to a school with virtually two teachers would be somewhat undesirable?—If there were two rooms it would not be undesirable.

1595. Do you think it would add materially to the cost of education?—Yes, I do not think the gain in efficiency would be equal to the enhanced cost.

1596. If you had to pay out of your own pocket would you be likely to introduce an innovation of that kind; would you place an assistant teacher in a school, in addition to the head-teacher, when that school could be well managed by a head-teacher and a pupil-teacher?—No, I would not.

1597. You think it would very materially increase the cost of education in those small schools?—Yes.

1598. Taking that question from another point of view: do you think it would be fair to our country children who are capable of becoming efficient teachers that they should be prevented from entering those schools in the localities where they were resident, in the capacity of pupil-teachers?—I do not think that is a desirable thing.

1599. Are they introduced as pupil-teachers in the same schools in which they are taught?—It is a rare occurrence; it happens occasionally; I think it is an undesirable procedure.

1600. Do they find employment in schools in reach of their homes?—In many cases they do; in other cases, of course, it is not so.

1601. Are the ranks of your pupil-teachers augmented to any great extent from the children in the country?—A considerable proportion of pupil-teacher candidates hail from the country; I should say more than a third, perhaps a half.

1602. In what class of schools do those pupil-teachers obtain employment?—In the small schools chiefly.

1603. If a system was rigidly adhered to of preventing pupil-teachers from entering those country schools as they do now, do you think you would be able to get pupil-teachers from the country as at present: would their parents be in a position to send their sons into the towns to receive their education as pupil-teachers?—Yes; I think the parents in the country districts would be willing to send their children to town as pupil-teachers; the pupil-teachers would get a subsidy of £10 in addition to their salary.

1604. Provided that there were openings for them?—Yes; there are occasional openings for them.

1605. Do you think that by appointing assistants in these cases where the country schools are growing in numbers, instead of appointing pupil-teachers, you would be shutting the gate against pupil-teachers, and not only that, but at the same time largely increasing the cost of education?—Yes; to a certain extent that is so.

1606. You have been asked a question about the qualifications of the average female teacher, and the qualifications of the average male teacher?—That is so; I say a male teacher is better able to manage the higher classes of the larger schools than a female teacher. It is a question of government to a large extent, and then a man can better exercise a little insinuation of terror.

1607. Is there not government by kindness also?—Yes.

1608. You think the control exercised by a woman is inferior to that of a man?—I think in the case of big boys that is true.

1609. We have been told it is a question of temperament, is that so?—It is a question of temperament and aptitude. I think male teachers are better in the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards, and female teachers in the lower standards.

1610. Which do you think is the more important—the breaking in of the infants to educational work, or the training of the children as they grow older?—I do not like to make invidious comparisons; the work of pupils in the two highest standards is, I think, much more important for education than that at the lower stages.

1611. Which is the more arduous work in the primary schools?—The teaching of the higher classes is, in most respects, the more arduous, though I do not think we can draw a very sharp distinction.

1612. I think you said you found female teachers break down under the strain involved in teaching the higher standards?—Yes, that is so.

1613. Have you found males break down?—Not nearly so often as females.

1614. Are you aware that females break down in other kinds of employment—for instance, seamstresses and tailoresses?—I have no idea as to that, and cannot make a comparison.

1615. On the whole, do you think the occupation of a teacher is better adapted for a male than a female, or should there be a certain amount of employment for each?—Up to Standard III. in the larger schools I think the work is suitable for females, and here they do work as good as, or better than, males. For the heads of the larger schools men are much preferable to women.

1616. What is your opinion of small country schools of an attendance of from 14 to 20? Is a male or a female better in that class of school?—I think a female can do as good work there as a man.

1617. Do you approve of the salary of £70 for females and £130 for males?—I think in schools of that kind the salaries should be more on a level, more equal.

1618. Have you found anomalies existing in the schools, such as a teacher doing the best and highest work and receiving anything but the best pay?—Yes, anomalies of that kind exist here; in many cases there had been no distinction in the positions of assistants.

1619. How do you think abuses of that nature can be rectified, supposing you have a teacher doing Sixth and Seventh Standard work, and receiving a very inadequate salary?—I think a teacher should be paid according to the work done, and the fixing of teachers' ranks on the school staff should be equitably revised.

1619A. Who is responsible for the abuses I have mentioned, assuming they exist?—I suppose the Boards of Education; they appoint new assistants, and do not sufficiently consider the staff-rank of assistants already in the schools. Many of these anomalies have arisen from transfers that circumstances had made desirable. A teacher of high rank, when transferred, usually got a corresponding rank or as near such as might be. Most of the anomalies are due to this cause.

RICHARD HOBBS, Ex-member of the Auckland Education Board, examined.

Mr. Hobbs: I was a member of the Board under the denominational system, thirty-five or thirty-six years ago. Since that time, I have been a member of the Board of Education in Auckland at different times. I was also Chairman of the Board in 1889 and 1890. You will see I have had good opportunity of getting an insight into the working of the Auckland Board of Education. I should like to say that the continual introduction of various scales and salaries by different members of the Board, who seem to think it their province when they become members to introduce a new scale, causes great unrest among the teachers, and, to my mind, is very detrimental to the cause of education. I have opposed the introduction of so many, and I opposed the last one introduced by Dr. McArthur. I consider that, if the Government had consented to grant us the increased capitation grant, which we applied for on more than one occasion, we should have been able to do something to meet the exigencies of the Auckland Education District. In passing, I may say that there are those who do not appear to realise the extent of settlement that is going on, and the continual demands made on the Auckland Board. It is not very long ago that we had a pressing wire from the Premier, urging the establishment of a school at the Tunnel in the King-country, which the Board at once agreed to. This was when I was Chairman of the Board. I think, without any doubt, that what you call a "colonial scale" would be very desirable indeed for the Colony of New Zealand. I take a great interest in education, because I feel that the hope of the future of this country lies in the education imparted to the children, and education is not a matter in which we should be cheeseparing. If there is a matter we should be liberal in, it is in the matter of education. I do not see that there is any difficulty about the necessary grants; the Premier's salary is raised, Cabinet Ministers' salaries are raised, the honorarium of members of Parliament was increased, and a bonus added, while the Treasurer boasts of a large surplus, so surely there is no difficulty about money. There should be a very liberal grant made to the Boards of Education in order that they may carry out the functions allotted to them. It has been very hard for us to apply to the department, and to be told there were no funds, and that certain matters would be "considered." At the same time I think a colonial scale would be very inequitable if all head-teachers were not placed on the same footing, and allotted a fixed sum, according to the size of their schools, as house allowance. I do not see how you can grant one man house allowance or a house, and not do so in the case of another man. In connection with the Onehunga School there is a good house for the head-teacher, and grounds out of which a man could almost get his living. The same is true at Epsom. Immediately adjoining is another school district with no house allowance. I think such a state of affairs monstrous; it is not equitable, and I hope the Commission will note it and endeavour to remedy the evil. To tell us that it may be arranged by and by is simply putting the matter off, and I think such a matter should be dealt with at the time of the arrangement of a colonial scale. I have heard remarks to-day about pupil-teachers that would almost indicate that pupil-teachers were well paid. I think it would be well to inquire what cadets in other branches of the Civil Service receive in the way of salary, and then the difficulty we have in getting boys to enter the teaching profession would be understood. Young people have applied to us for positions, but have been taken from us owing to letters coming from the Treasury, the Railway, and the Post and Telegraph, and the Customs Departments, where the young people start at £65 a year, with an annual increase. No wonder, then, that young people leave the teaching profession, or fight shy of it, when they are allowed only £20 or £30 a year. I believe a colonial scale will do away with those heart-burnings, and I think the House will be prepared to deal liberally with the question of education.

1620. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Are you satisfied with the half-time school system?—As a convenient arrangement I am perfectly satisfied with it.

1621. You wish to see the salaries of teachers brought up and not levelled down?—Yes; I think it was a mistake to reduce the salaries of the best and head-teachers in our large schools. I think if they all received house allowance it would compensate them, and that such an arrangement would be fairly equitable.

OLIVER MAYS, Chairman of the Devonport School Committee.

Mr. Mays: I have been twenty years Chairman of one of the largest School Committees in Auckland, and I am an old teacher myself. With reference to a colonial scale of salaries, I think it is desirable for teachers: First, because continual uncertainty as to salaries exercises a prejudicial effect on teachers; secondly, because it is manifestly just that teachers should receive the same rate of pay throughout the colony. I regret to learn that the proposed colonial scale will reduce the salaries of headmasters of large schools. This I think both unnecessary and unfair to the Board's most experienced and responsible servants. If house allowance were added to these salaries, the proposed scale would be more satisfactory. I think the headmaster of a large school such as Devonport, with an average attendance of over 500, should receive a salary of £350 a year at least.

NEW PLYMOUTH.

THURSDAY, 6TH JUNE, 1901.

D. MCALLUM, Chairman of the Taranaki Education Board, examined.

Mr. McAllum: First of all, I wish to say that I am in favour of this colonial scale of salaries for the teachers, or, what would suit the Taranaki District better, a graduated capitation scheme, so as to place this education district on a similar footing with the other education districts of the colony. If the department were to introduce a colonial scheme of salaries the amount proposed for administrative purposes—11s. 3d. *per capita*—would not be sufficient for this Board. A balance-sheet has been prepared, details of which will be submitted to you later on, showing how that would come out. Under the proposal of 11s. 3d. *per capita* this Board would lose nearly £700 on what it has at the present time, and, as compared with other districts, teachers in Taranaki are underpaid. They do not receive sufficient remuneration for the services rendered. The inducement offered for promising material is not good enough to bring them forward; and that might be emphasized by the fact that when any vacancies occur in our district we receive very few applications indeed to supply those vacancies. I may say I am not altogether in favour of equal pay to male and female teachers. We find here that in the matter of illness females are a greater expense to the Board than are males; they can live cheaper than males can; and, further, they frequently get married, and by these marriages the schools are disorganized, and the pupils thrown back in their lessons. The Board some time ago, recognising the difficulty of getting the best boys to come forward as teachers, proposed to award them a higher salary, but unfortunately the department put its foot down and stopped it.

1. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you think the Inspectors ought to be under the Board or under the Goverment?—I think they ought to be under the Government.

2. Have you any half-time schools here?—No.

3. Have you any provision for sick allowance?—The Board always allows teachers who have been in the Board's service twelve months one month's salary when away through illness.

4. Have you seen the scales that are being discussed by the Commission?—I have not seen the second one.

5. In the readjustment of our educational system, I take it it is your wish that the system should be built up to the level of the best-paid system in the colony?—Certainly.

6. Even although that may exceed the £4 capitation grant within which we are supposed to work?—Yes.

7. I also take it as your opinion that if the £4 is not quite sufficient to bring the salaries up to the best you do not wish to see the better paid reduced?—Certainly not.

8. Do you consider the work of a first assistant in a town school as difficult as that of a teacher of a country school with, say, 40 or 45?—Certainly I do.

9. And you think they should be paid about alike?—Yes, I think so.

10. Have you any system of promotion of teachers here?—No; everything is submitted to the School Committees. They select, the Board confirms.

11. Do you not think that some system whereby colonial promotion might be carried on might be considered?—Yes; when I say we have no scheme of promotion here, I should perhaps say that it has been done here, but with great difficulty.

12. What increase of incidental allowance would you require?—I would not like to say.

13. You say you would lose £700: is your present allowance sufficient?—No, if we take into consideration the Building Fund. It would take £500 to repaint our buildings, and we have very few school residences indeed in the district. In one case a teacher who has six children has to live in three rooms partitioned off from the school.

14. Do you approve of so much canvassing by teachers?—I personally oppose anything like that.

15. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you not think that if a colonial scale of salaries were introduced, and the salaries of the small schools of Taranaki brought up to the highest grade now paid in any part of the colony, that would be better than a capitation grant?—If the amount *per capita* were higher we would be satisfied.

16. Have you worked out the amount you would receive for incidental expenses *plus* the £250, and showing, as you state, a loss of £700?—The total receipts would come to £2,268 19s. 10d., against which we would have an expenditure of £2,962 15s., leaving a deficit of £693 15s. 2d.

17. Would you be in favour of establishing training-colleges and a system of scholarships whereby your pupil-teachers could receive training?—Certainly I should.

18. If such a system were carried out, the item "£216, training of pupil-teachers," would be saved to your Board?—There might be a few of the items saved, but in making up our computation we took our expenditure for last year.

19. Then, again, where you have no house provided for the teacher I understand you make a house allowance?—Yes.

20. If the Commission suggested an arrangement to provide for that item by a separate vote, that also would save to your Board £256?—Yes.

21. So that the loss would be very much smaller to the Board if these items could be saved? —Yes; but still we have been very cheeseparing in the past. We should spend £500 now on actually urgent works.

22. Of course, you know that painting would come out of the building grant, and would have nothing to do with the 11s. 3d.?—Yes.

23. You consider the salaries paid in this district altogether inadequate for the services rendered, and not sufficient to induce the best class of boys to enter the service?—Yes.

24. When vacancies occur in the service do you get applications from outside the district? —Yes, a few.

25. Do applicants from other districts receive appointments in Taranaki?—There is an applications committee, and the very best of the applicants are picked out and dealt with.

26. *Mr. Stewart.*] You are not at all in favour, I presume, of the great discrepancy that exists in the payment of teachers throughout New Zealand?—No.

27. Have you thought how the discrepancies arise—what is the main cause of them?—I have not been able to come to any satisfactory conclusion about it.

28. You suggested there should be a differential capitation grant: do you think, supposing there was a differential capitation grant, that that would remove the anomalies in payments?—I think it would do a good deal towards it in this district, where the schools are so scattered and the attendance below the paying-mark.

29. But do not differences arise, not so much through financial complications as from the fact that there are thirteen different Boards drawing up thirteen different scales of payment?—That might be.

30. You say you have a great number of small and non-paying schools?—Yes.

31. Are they likely to increase in number as settlement goes on?—There is no doubt about that.

32. So that the capitation grant this year may not do for your requirements next year?—I do not know that it would change so rapidly as that.

33. Under a colonial scale there would be a fixed salary attached to a school of a given size, and if you had more of that class of school your means would rise in proportion?—So far as the teachers are concerned, we consider a colonial scale best for them; but it is for administrative purposes that we are looking at it.

34. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long have you been Chairman of this Board?—About two years.

35. Do you find, taken as a whole, that the salaries of the teachers in the Taranaki District are too low?—Yes, decidedly.

36. You have not had an opportunity of comparing the suggested scale with the scale that obtains in Taranaki?—No; I have not seen it yet.

37. You have not the same difficulty in securing the services of female teachers as you have in getting males, especially in the smaller districts?—No.

38. Is there a considerable preponderance of female teachers in the service of the Board?— Speaking from memory, I think yes.

39. Does the Board give the preference to female teachers so that they may teach sewing, play the piano or church-organ?—I do not think they do.

40. I suppose there is a considerable number of schools to which no residence is attached?— That is true.

41. With regard to pupil-teachers, do you not consider there are too many pupil-teachers, comparatively speaking, in the service of the Taranaki Board?—If we have fewer pupil-teachers we will have fewer teachers coming on.

42. With regard to the smaller schools, is it possible or practicable in any part of the district to convey pupils to a central school?—Most of them are conveyed on horseback, and you cannot well get any better form of locomotion. As many as three of them ride one horse at one time.

43. Do you not consider it would be more economical if you could do away with the side-school for the infants in New Plymouth?—Both the main and side schools at New Plymouth and Stratford are filled to their utmost capacity.

44. Has your Board had to entrench on the salaries fund for building purposes?—No.

45. Respecting the adoption of a colonial scale, do you consider the power of the Board would be diminished by the adoption of a scale laid down by the department?—No, I do not think so.

46. *Mr. Hill.*] With reference to the discrepancies existing in the wages paid to teachers doing the same kind of work, do you think that the same exist in other callings? For instance, do you think that a draper's assistant in New Plymouth would be paid the same amount as a draper's assistant in Wellington or Dunedin?—I do not know. I have no more idea than the man in the moon on such a question as that. I think perhaps labour is dearer here than in other parts of the colony.

47. Would you expect the same wage to exist throughout the colony for the same class of work, say, in the case of teachers?—Yes; I think they ought to have the same wage throughout the colony, because it is the same class of work.

48. Do you not think that there are differences in the cost of living in the various parts of the colony?—Yes; and I think teachers in some parts ought to be paid more than in others because of the hardships they have to put up with.

49. Suppose a number of teachers held the same class of certificate, would you suggest that they should get the same rate of wage?—That is rather a difficult question. The man with the best power of imparting his knowledge to the children should get the highest salary.

50. Do you select your men on that principle?—If we know them personally it weighs with the selection committee. We require men with the best powers of teaching irrespective of classification.

51. Do you find that the money which you give to the various School Committees is sufficient for the Committees to maintain the various schools?—I think every meeting of the Board we waste several hours fighting over the question of the insufficient grant to School Committees. If it was not for the labours of the settlers these schools would go to wreck and ruin in no time.

52. Do you find it necessary to pay any of the maintenance allowance in to the Building Fund?—Not to my knowledge.

53. You have between three and four thousand children: what do you think of the merging of your district with, say, that of Wanganui: do you think it would be better for this district?—I do not know that the people would oppose it; but I think they would find the district too large to manage.

54. Do you recognise that the colonial scale would limit the functions of your Board?—It might; but no doubt many Education Boards would be very willing to have their functions taken over by the Government.

55. *Mr. Smith.*] You referred to a certain number of schools that were not paying?—Yes; the majority of our schools cost more than the capitation earned.

56. Do you know what average attendance is required to make a school payable?—About 40 or 45.

57. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Have you any aided schools in the district?—There are two at present, and one will be dropped in a very short time.

58. *Mr. Weston.*] I think you favoured the location of the Inspectors at Wellington?—I said I thought they would be better under Government control.

59. Why do you think they should be under the control of the General Government?—Because in this way they could be changed from one district to another. It would give greater satisfaction to the parents and the Committees in the various districts.

60. How many Inspectors have you?—One.

61. In a district where there are two or three Inspectors, would not the Inspectors be able to change about, and take the schools alternately?—Yes.

62. Would that in any way alter the view you have just taken?—It might.

63. I suppose, as a matter of fact, that you take counsel with your Inspector in the matter of appointments, and so forth?—Well, hardly. Whatever applications come to the Board are placed before the teachers' selection committee. That committee goes through the testimonials and other matters, and picks out the very best to lay before the Board.

64. Do you limit the number?—No. The best are selected by the Board and sent on to the committee for their selection, and we confirm their selection.

65. Have you any theory for the removal of the difficulty of getting male pupil-teachers?—Yes; we offered a larger salary.

66. Is that the only method you have thought of by which to meet it?—Yes; at present.

67. Do you think that the appointment of pupil-teachers is an advantage or a disadvantage in a school?—I think it is an advantage. It is like an apprenticeship in any other trade.

68. Do you think that boy-teachers are capable of imparting efficient instruction to the pupils in the school?—I think, to the junior classes they are quite capable of doing so.

69. Would you favour handing over a class in a school to a pupil-teacher?—Certainly.

70. Without any supervision?—We always have them under the supervision of a teacher. They are practically in the same room with the assistant.

71. The pupil-teacher is under the supervision of the teacher in charge of that class?—Yes.

72. Can pupil-teachers in your district receive sufficient instruction to become good and efficient teachers afterwards?—The pupil-teachers of our own training that we have been able to advance have given us the best results of any teachers in Taranaki.

73. Then, do you require a training-school?—It would be an advantage if we had a training-school; it would save us a good deal of worry and expense, and possibly bring on the pupil-teachers better.

74. Then, you think that a pupil-teacher in a small school cannot qualify himself to become a certificated master?—That is our experience to a certain extent.

75. Would you tell me what, in your opinion, should be the minimum salary for male and female teachers in your schools?—I would rather not answer that question, but leave it to the experts. I should say £75.

76. What is the minimum paid now?—£50.

77. Are you able to find the required number of teachers readily under your present scale of payment?—No; we have great difficulty in getting teachers, especially for the small schools.

78. Has this Board received complaints from teachers as to the smallness of their pay?—I do not know that we have; but I think it is just because they knew it was no use complaining.

79. You said that the circumstances of the various districts and the rate of living should be taken into consideration in allotting salaries: then, I presume it would follow that, if the circumstances of Canterbury, for instance, were different to those of Taranaki, these different circumstances would be taken into account in assessing salaries?—Yes.

80. If that be so, what becomes of a colonial scale?—I was thinking about the administrative expenses: you are referring to salaries.

81. You advocate a colonial scale, do you not?—I am in favour of it.

82. You tell me that in assessing the salaries the circumstances of the various educational districts should be considered—that is to say, in one district where the expense of living is higher you would probably give the teacher there more than you would give the teacher in a district where the circumstances were favourable to cheap living?—No, I did not mean that. I was referring more to the difficulty of getting to the schools. On account of not having residences attached to many of the schools, teachers have to lodge wherever they can get accommodation, and this means a considerable expense for travelling over the bad roads.

83. Do you think the circumstances of the various districts should be considered in the assessing of salaries?—I am in favour of a colonial scale to teachers; but, as far as the amount *per capita* to the Board is concerned, that ought to be taken into consideration.

84. The circumstances of Otago, Canterbury, Wellington, Wanganui, Taranaki, Auckland, and Hawke's Bay may differ: do you think such differences should be taken into consideration when the salaries are assessed?—I should say so. It is a matter for the Commission to decide. I think the teachers should be paid the same throughout New Zealand.

85. If in the payment of salaries there be a differential scale, you cannot have a colonial scale or uniform scale, can you?—I cannot express an opinion on that.

86. For what purposes are the incidental allowances granted to the various School Committees?—For cleaning and maintaining in good order the school and grounds and fences, and for doing petty repairs.

87. Can you form an opinion from the complaints you have received as to the additional sum your Board should pay to the several Committees?—I should say, double the amount we already pay—viz., £1,060.

88. Is it a fact that in the country schools there is very irregular attendance by the children?—There must be, especially in the winter months, on account of the bad roads and the distance the children have to travel.

89. But does not the nature of the dairy industry preclude many children from attending regularly during the school-hours?—It has a bearing on it; but during the summer months, when dairying is in full swing, the attendance is fairly good.

90. Is it not true, also, that a number of children from force of circumstances are employed hunting up and milking cows, and come to school in a state of fatigue?—Yes. I think many of them are late in their attendance. There is no doubt about it that they are fatigued when they start their duties, and are not in a fit state to receive tuition.

91. If that is so, then you say that the children are receiving the full benefit of our national education system?—I do not think they are in that case. What we must consider is that people must live first and get their education afterwards.

92. What do you pay your Board members for travelling-expenses?—Actual travelling-expenses.

93. How often does the Board meet?—Every second Wednesday—about twenty-six meetings in the year.

94. Is that not rather many meetings for this district?—It takes us all our time.

95. Have you a Building Committee?—No; but we have a Finance Committee, and that practically means the same.

96. What do you mean by your building-allowance being insufficient?—We cannot maintain our buildings.

97. Do you mean that you have not enough money to build sufficient schools, or to keep the schools in order?—If the amount of money received were devoted to repairs and painting it might be sufficient, but if we have to build a new school out of it it would run away with it all at one time.

98. It must follow that unless the ordinary capitation grant for incidentals be increased your buildings cannot be maintained and Government property must deteriorate?—That is so.

99. Supposing an alteration in the staffing required an assistant in some of the schools that are now taught single-handed, would alterations or additions to some of the schools become necessary?—I think, very probably it would be so.

100. I suppose the single-handed schools are no larger than are required for present purposes?—That is so.

101. What do you advocate in regard to first assistant teachers: do you think they should receive higher salaries than they are paid now?—Yes, I think so.

102. Do you think that the first-assistant's liability to be called upon to fill the position of headmaster in case of emergency should be taken into account in assessing the salary?—Yes, I think so.

103. You do not think that the cases of emergency are so infrequent as to make it unnecesssry that they should be taken into consideration?—I do not think so.

104. Does your Board advocate the employment of female teachers, and not male teachers, in small schools?—Generally, I think there might be a leaning in that direction.

105. Do you consider that the small schools would be better in charge of females than males?—I think so.

106. Up to what size of schools?—20 to 25.

107. Has your Board ever considered the number of children that could be efficiently taught by one teacher?—Yes; I think they consider generally it should not be more than 40 in a class.

108. Does your Board favour the leaving of the school to one teacher up to 40, or have you advocated either a monitor or a pupil-teacher to act with that teacher?—We give a pupil-teacher when the attendance is over 40.

109. Is it thought by your Inspector, and the teachers generally, that a teacher can conduct schools up to 40?—I think so.

110. Does the Board think that one teacher can manage all the standards up to 40?—Yes.

111. After 40, do you consider there should be an assistant with the master?—Personally I do.

112. Do you think that your scale deals fairly with the relative positions of masters and mistresses—in other words, do you think that the male and female teachers receive justly proportionate pay?—I think so.

113. Do you approve of the master of a small school being mulcted in the price of a sewing-mistress?—Certainly not.

114. What is your practice here: when a master is in sole charge of a school, do you mulct him in the cost of a sewing-mistress?—No.

115. *Mr. Hogben.*] In the influence of local circumstances on salaries that you refer to, was the matter of the expense incurred by the teacher in travelling over bad roads from his lodging or residence to the school included?—That is one of the circumstances.

116. Supposing, on the recommendation of the Commission, Boards were provided with enough money to provide residences or house allowance sufficient to overcome that difficulty, the local circumstances would cease to be an operative cause?—So far as the financial aspect is concerned; but you must take into account that the teachers are more or less affected by the bad state of the roads. If money were given us to build residences it would get over the difficulty at once.

117. I suppose in some parts of the district groceries are harder to get than in New Plymouth?—Yes; in some places it is almost impossible to get them at all.

118. Do you think it is practicable to devise a scale to pay according to the price of necessities in the various districts?—No.

119. You said the department stopped the Board from giving higher salaries to the male pupil-teachers: do you not think it would be more correct to say that the department stopped the Board from giving lower salaries to female pupil-teachers?—No.

120. You raised the salaries of the male pupil-teachers, but did not the Minister ask that the salaries of the females should be raised to those of the males?—That might be; but the object we sought to obtain was lost if we did that.

121. Are you aware that with a district high school on the numbers as at present you would receive £104 per annum under the special grant?—I am not thoroughly aware as to how it would result.

122. If the amount is approximately that, it would meet your charge of £21?—Yes, I should say so.

123. Your remarks with respect to capitation I take to apply to the money available for the general expenses of the Board after salaries are paid?—That is so.

124. *The Chairman.*] You think it would be better if the Inspectors were under the department?—Yes.

125. Is that because there would be an advantage in moving them from district to district?—I think that whatever dissatisfaction is existing among Committees or parents just now might be done away with, and I think it would be fairer for the Inspectors.

126. Do you think it would be an improvement to have the Inspectors made irresponsible so far as the Boards or the parents were concerned?—I have not considered it in that way.

127. Do you not think it would be more unpleasant to the Inspector himself?—My own idea was that it would be just as well that the Inspectors should be interchangeable, and it could be done possibly by agreement between the Boards.

128. Do you not think it would be better, after all, to keep the Inspectors under your control?—I think, under those circumstances, it would be better to do so.

129. Do you know how many salaries there are over £200 under your Board?—Three or four.

130. And how many salaries are there over £150 and under £200?—I think, about nine.

131. Then, nearly the whole of your schools are manned by teachers with salaries under £150?—Yes.

132. Do you think that that is a fair salary for a competent teacher, who has spent years in acquiring his position, and who has to live in a country district where the cost of provisions is considerable?—I think a teacher ought to be paid £3 a week, at any rate.

GEORGE W. POTTS, representing the Taranaki Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Potts: I am headmaster of the Bell Block School, and am representing the local branch of the Educational Institute. I approve of the colonial scale of salaries. The only point, I think, that I find several teachers have complained of in the proposed scale is as to the payment of junior teachers and second masters in two of the big schools; otherwise the scale seems to meet with approval throughout the district.

133. Have you seen the second scheme?—No.

134. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Would you favour the centralisation of Inspectors?—Yes. I do not think that one district should be inspected year after year by the same Inspectors.

135. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—About thirty years; from the very smallest school up to schools of about 100.

136. According to this second suggested scale, the assistance given to a sole teacher is at 40, and the assistance takes the form of a certificated mistress?—I think it should be lower. I think it is almost impossible for any teacher to do justice to a school of 40.

137. Do you know that in Southland and Otago a sole teacher has to teach up to 50?—Yes; but I do not think it can be altogether satisfactory.

138. And do you know that the same thing occurs in Victoria and the other Australian States? —I have heard so.

139. At what average attendance do you think the assistance should come in?—At 35.

140. Suppose you had a school of 35, what part of that school would under the control of the mistress?—Generally speaking, I suppose the infants and Standards I. and II. if all classes were represented.

141. If you were to take the infants and Standards I. and II. from a school having an average attendance of 35 you would probably leave 15 pupils for the master: do you think that the teaching-power would not be too great in such a school?—The upper classes would take up the time. A teacher might as easily teach 50 as the 15.

142. At the present time in Taranaki a sole teacher teachers up to 40, does he not?—Yes.

143. He receives a very much lower rate of pay than a teacher occupying a similar position in Otago, Southland, and other parts of the colony?—Yes.

144. Would you prefer to teach 3 or 4 more children and receive higher pay than receive assistance and a lower rate of pay?—Personally, I would rather receive the lower rate of pay and teach a lower number and have assistance. I think 40 children could be taught, but I do not think they could be taught to give thorough satisfaction.

145. What is the form of assistance you would suggest?—Certainly not a pupil-teacher, for I think a pupil-teacher is at a great disadvantage in being brought up in a small school like that. They cannot be properly supervised.

146. Do you consider that two certificated teachers should be placed in charge of a school having an average attendance not greater than 35?—It seems large, but I would approve of it.

147. Have you ever considered the desirability of placing in such a school not a raw pupil-teacher commencing his first year, but, say, a third-year pupil-teacher?—I think that might do as well as a certificated teacher.

148. From 35 to 60, would you suggest, instead of a mistress, as proposed in the scale, a pupil-teacher of the third year?—I think a third-year pupil-teacher up to 55 might meet the requirements.

149. Have you considered the desirability of appointing to such schools neither a pupil-teacher nor a certificated mistress, but a monitor who has passed through the school as a pupil, giving a salary of, say, £12 a year, and not to be considered as qualifying for a teacher?—I think that such a monitor would be quite as efficient as a first- or second-year pupil-teacher.

150. Do you think there are too many pupil-teachers in this district?—Decidedly.

151. Do your pupil-teachers find places readily after the completion of their course?—I think that most of them have found positions so far, but many of them leave the service after finishing their course. Many of them have no intention of going on.

152. Then, the training as teachers is practically wasted on such?—Yes.

153. Would you, then, approve of the suggestion of having a monitor between 30 and 40, and then bring in a certificated mistress?—I think that would meet all the requirements—I think it is a very good suggestion.

154. *Mr. Stewart.*] May we take the opinions you have expressed as your own, or as those of the class of teachers you represent?—I think, as far as I know, my opinions represent the teachers of the district.

155. Are we to distinctly understand that your teachers are unanimous in approving of a colonial scale in the abstract?—I never met one who did not think it was necessary.

156. Have you ever lived in any other provincial district?—Yes.

157. From your experience, do you think that the varying cost of living is sufficiently great in the different districts to be taken into consideration in forming a basis of payment of teachers? —I think the difference is counterbalanced in so many ways that it would be impossible to take it into consideration.

158. You were speaking to the point at which assistance should be given — whether at 35 or 40: would it not very much depend on how the 5 extra children were distributed among the classes?—Yes.

159. In these schools, say, from 35 to 40, or 35 to 45, do you think that all the classes would be represented?—In my case they always have been, except twice.

160. Do you not think, then, you are pushing the argument too far when you say it would not be in the interests of the school that the assistance should not come in till 40; one extra pupil in four or five of the classes, would that materially cripple you in the conduct of the school?—It would make a very great difference in the working of the school if an extra class were involved.

161. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to the centralisation of Inspectors, are you aware that at the recent conference of Inspectors a resolution was carried in favour of centralisation?—I have seen it stated.

162. You consider, then, that if the Inspectors were placed under the central department it would lead to uniformity of inspection and examination, and also of assignment of marks so as to enable teachers to get higher certificates on some regular principle?—I think it would lead to greater uniformity in examination.

163. With regard to bringing in the assistance at 35, I suppose you are aware that when the staff is over-liberal the salaries will not be so liberal as they otherwise would be?—I am not speaking for the Institute in this particular case; but I consider it the hardest school to teach, and I would rather take a lower salary and have assistance.

164. With regard to the syllabus, do you consider that we should differentiate in the country schools?—Certainly.

165. Do you consider that 50 per cent. is too low for the operation of the working-average?— I think it is too low, and, except in very small schools, it is very seldom that the average goes below half.

166. Do you consider it should be raised?—I think three-fifths would be a very fair number to raise it to.

167. Do you approve of a sole male teacher being required to pay £10 a year out of his salary for a sewing-mistress?—There is a certain amount of fairness in it, and I suppose it is put in to encourage the appointment of females to very small schools; that is how I read it.

168. The sewing-mistress is of no assistance to the teacher in the school?—No.

169. Do you favour a fine or penalty being imposed on any teacher who does not hold the requisite certificate?—I regarded the 5 per cent., and so on, not as a fine on the teacher not holding the certificate, but as a bonus to those holding the certificate.

170. Supposing, then, this scale is adopted, and we require for the Stratford School, with an attendance of 313, a headmaster with a certificate of C1, and the occupant of the position only holds a D1, do you consider that in a case of that kind the headmaster should be fined 1 per cent.?—I have not heard any objections made to that part of the scale. So far as the Institute is concerned, we have not discussed that point.

171. Do you approve of capitation to teachers being increased per unit?—Yes; most strongly.

172. Is the house allowance of 4s. 6d. per week, given in Taranaki, sufficient?—I suppose in some of the country districts it is nearly equivalent to the rent of a house.

173. *Mr. Hill.*] What is your average attendance?—44 or 45.

174. What is your staffing?—A female pupil-teacher.

175. Do you find that staffing satisfactory?—No. I do not find that I can do justice to the pupil-teacher in the way of supervising her work.

176. What work do you intrust her to do?—The infant class, the First Standard, and most of the Second Standard.

177. How many pupils have you above Standard II.?—An average of about 25.

178. Is your time-table arranged with a view to merging as much as possible?—Yes; but I do not find it satisfactory.

179. Which standards are merged?—The Fifth and Sixth especially.

180. Suppose the regulation for the staffing of small schools was so arranged that all schools up to 30 or 35 were to be placed under a mistress, and between 35 and 45 under a master, with a view of giving better salaries to the master in one case, and good salaries to the mistress in the other, do you think such an arrangement would be a wise course to adopt?—I do not think so, because of the variations in attendance. My school varies as much as 10 in a quarter.

181. Does your school vary in a sufficient manner to warrant the withdrawal of the master on the lines of attendance suggested?—Our pupil-teacher was appointed on those lines, but in my case the pupil-teacher was allowed to remain.

182. Do you think that the certificates B and A are essential to teachers of the public schools of the colony?—No; but I think that having something to gain gives a stimulus to teachers to continue their work.

183. Supposing certificates were done away with altogether from the proposed scale, would it debar teachers from applying?—No, certainly not.

184. Under such circumstances, what do you think a teacher applying for a position would do?—He would send in his best qualifications.

185. Who would be judge of the qualifications?—The Board.

186. So that the certificate is not necessary for this scale?—No.

187. Do you think, then, that a teacher should be punished because he is not in the possession of a degree?—It seems hard that he should.

188. *Mr. Weston.*] What do you think should be the minimum salary for a teacher—male and female—in our schools?—£100.

189. Do you think the same minimum should be given to each sex?—I do not think it would exactly "pan out" as some people imagine; I do not think it would be altogether to the benefit of the female teachers.

190. Now, then, which do you think would be the best—a lady teacher or a male teacher—for the small schools, say, up to 25?—I do not think there is any particular choice, provided they are of equal ability.

191. Do you think that the general run of pupil-teachers are competent to impart instruction in our schools?—I do not think so. I think many of them are very indifferent.

192. Would it be to the advantage of a district that a pupil-teacher trained in a small school, and taking his certificate, should receive an appointment as teacher in one of the small schools?—It depends altogether on the pupil-teacher. I know splendid teachers who have never been out of a small school.

193. Do you think that a training-school should be established in this district?—It would be a great advantage to the district.

194. Do you think that the children in our smaller schools are able to cope with the children in the larger schools in the matter of scholarships?—Not on equal terms.

195. Does your Board give the children of the country schools the benefit of a year in the scholarship examinations?—No allowance is made.

196. What system of promotion would you yourself, as a teacher of experience, advocate?—I cannot see anything that is fairer than promotion by Inspector's marks.

197. *Mr. Hogben.*] You suggested £100 as a minimum salary for a teacher: were you referring to a head-teacher or an assistant?—To a sole teacher. I think an assistant in a town school might begin with a lower salary.

198. It has been suggested that there should be a modification of the syllabus in the direction of requiring fewer subjects in schools with a sole teacher: would that relieve the pressure that there is at present in such schools?—I think it would.

199. Do you think it would be possible to so choose the subjects of the syllabus that the number of classes in the small schools might be brought below six?—You must have six at the very least.

200. Is it not a fact that in the manual instruction it is generally required that there should be fewer pupils per teacher than in the more mechanical method?—I think, if you are going to bring in manual instruction into the primary schools you must have fewer pupils per teacher.

THURSDAY, 7TH JUNE, 1901.

W. E. SPENCER, M.A., B.Sc., Inspector of Schools, examined.

Mr. Spencer: Whatever scheme may be carried, the result, I am satisfied, is going to be of the greatest benefit to the whole colony, and particularly to Taranaki. I refer to this district, as it is classed as one of the smaller districts. We find the greatest difficulty in inducing promising lads to enter the teaching profession; in fact, labourers are as well paid as the majority of teachers in the profession, and artisans are better paid. The lowness of the salaries paid causes constant changes, tending to decreased efficiency in school-work; not only that, but we are sometimes met with this fact: we must either close a school or appoint a teacher whom we know to be inefficient and incompetent to carry on the work; that has practically been the position in a few cases here. Moreover, the tendency is for the weaker class of teachers to be driven into the smaller, and therefore weaker, districts. This difficulty has cropped up because we cannot afford to pay for the services of a good teacher, and even the inefficient teacher may give a *quid pro quo* for the amount he receives. For equivalent responsibility and equivalent work a good teacher here should receive the same salary as is paid to a teacher doing similar work in another district; but it is not so—such a teacher here will receive £40 a year less. If good salaries are paid, and thereby good teachers obtained, the status of the teachers and the general efficiency of the district will be raised. With regard to the staffing laid down in the proposed scheme, and also in the alternative scheme, there may be somewhat of a difficulty so far as this district is concerned. There may be some such difficulty in carrying it out owing to the scarcity of assistants. I consider that a school with an attendance between 40 and 50, with a first-year pupil-teacher, is the hardest class of school to work; with a third-year pupil-teacher it is not so difficult. The proposal, under the suggested scale, the alternative scale, to introduce an assistant at 40 is certainly a great relief to the teacher in that class of schools; our scale does not give an assistant till an attendance of 70 is reached. In reality, however, the staffing in our schools is not so meagre as it would appear, because generally our fifth-year pupil-teachers are appointed to schools of an attendance of 56, so that in schools with that average attendance there would be really a head-teacher and an ex-pupil-teacher—one who has passed through his or her term of apprenticeship, and is really as good as an assistant. Under the proposed staffing we would be benefited. Our staffing as at present is as follows: Sixty-six head-teachers, four male assistants, and fourteen female assistants, and thirty-six pupil-teachers, *plus* a cadet; there is one extra assistant for the Stratford District High School. The proposed scale would still give sixty-six head-teachers, but an increase of three male assistants, seventeen female assistants, and a falling-off of nineteen pupil-teachers. These increases go chiefly towards relieving the work in the hardest class of schools—the hardest then become the easiest. I think we should have difficulty in getting these extra assistants unless increased inducements were held out. With regard to schools with an attendance of 40, of course the average attendance varies considerably, and constant changes in the staff are likely to be made, for these are the schools in which we are constantly appointing or removing a pupil-teacher, and the same would hold in the case of the assistant. Generally, a school with an attendance of 40 is a country school in a settled district, and there is not much prospect of getting a large permanent increase, so that in this way I see a little difficulty. With regard to mistresses, I think they require a little more assistance than is proposed to be given at present, especially if kindergarten work, requiring close supervision, is taken up, for I think 30 pupils sufficient for a teacher. I think also that the syllabus requires modification—that alternative schemes should be brought forward. Why should not the teacher be allowed to choose that particular line of subjects which that teacher may be particularly adapted to teach? The teachers would then be able to satisfactorily instruct the children in the subjects they (the teachers) were strong in. All our teachers may not be capable of manual work. Reverting to kindergarten work again, I think some provision should be made for teaching children under five years of age. In regard to certificates, I think the jump from E5 to E2 too great; in schools of from 19 to 35 I think a teacher with E3 may do very good work. I think a great deal might be done in the way of improving the method of making appointments, for, as far as the Board is concerned, they wish to see the best teachers appointed; and classification frequently depends on the district in which a teacher is working. In schools of from 19 to 35 in average attendance I think E3 teachers perform very satisfactory work indeed. With regard to the increases in salaries, sixty-three teachers here get increases, and three are reduced. The increases are as follows: Under £10, five; under £20, five; under £30, twenty-three; under £40, twenty-one; under £50, eight; under £60, one. Looking at these increases, I am satisfied that they are well allocated, and that the increases are in the schools that are the hardest to teach. These increases do not include house allowance, fees for the instruction of pupil-teachers, or payment to sewing-teachers. I said the increases are very fair ones generally. There are no aided schools here; and of teachers receiving under £100 we have thirteen, while previously there were thirty-three teachers. Furthermore, this scheme embraces what I consider has put Otago and other districts on such a satisfactory footing—namely, the system of bonuses. This method of deduction in the suggested scale I consider to be an excellent idea, and they are very fairly paid. One per cent. is taken off for each class and 4 per cent. for each

division; I think the latter deduction recognises that teaching skill is of greater importance than literary ability, though, of course, literary ability should not be neglected. With regard to a superannuation scheme, I think that no scheme of paying salaries should be brought forward unless sufficient provision is made for superannuation. With regard to the payment of teachers' salaries, there is the effect of epidemics to be taken into consideration. This district, in common with other districts, has been visited by epidemics, and as a result the salaries of the teachers have fallen, though at the same time their work has been really increased; they have to teach the same subjects over and over again, entailing on the teachers considerable worry. I think that difficulty might be met by the percentage of exemptions in computing the working-average, or else by paying on the average attendance of the previous quarter. With regard to the salaries paid to the assistants, I am not so satisfied with the scheme. In this district there are seventeen assistants, eleven of whom receive increases amounting to £257 3s., while the other six are decreased to the extent of £115 in the three large schools. The salary of one second assistant would be reduced by £50; another assistant would lose £30. With one exception, all decreases are in schools of an attendance over 300. However, I understand, from an explanation given by the Inspector-General, that this difficulty is practically overcome by the alternative scheme. I should like to remark that the first and second male assistants in a large school are really the backbone of the school, and next to them comes the infant mistress, whose work is extremely important. She has charge of the groundwork of the school, and the First, Second, and Third Standards suffer considerably if her work be not good. The work of the infant mistress is as important as that of the first and second male assistants. With regard to the payment of pupil-teachers, I think an excellent proposal is brought forward in the suggested scheme, and one that I would like to have seen adopted by this Board, but it was impossible to do so on account of lack of funds. I refer to the allowance made to pupil-teachers when living away from home. I am inclined to think that the salary of £20 for a first-year pupil-teacher is too low. I should like to see classes in school-management included in technical instruction, and grants made to them, as far as the pupil-teachers are concerned. If technical work is taught in separate classes we should not neglect the very groundwork, the skill in teaching. The more the pupil-teachers are improved the more also are the teachers improved generally, and that is a point I should like to urge—there should be lectures in school-management and grants made for them. Speaking of the difficulty of getting male pupil-teachers, in this district we have thirty-three pupil-teachers at present, only seven of whom are males. Regarding the 11s. 3d. capitation grant, it really perpetuates an error made by the present capitation grant, for neither is the cost of instruction nor the cost of administration *per capita* invariable; they are not dependent on the numbers taught in a district, and the cost of administration must depend upon the distribution of pupils. If all the children in this district were collected in a few schools the grant would be sufficient. £250, *plus* 11s. 3d., will not meet present expenses, and will allow for no extension in many directions that may be desirable and urgent. In this matter Boards require a living-wage as well as individuals. Payment should be on a sliding-scale. To speak of equal payment for equal work in the cases of male and female teachers sounds very well. In schools with an attendance of 25, male and female teachers do equally good work; possibly females do better—it depends entirely on the teacher. When it comes to schools of an average attendance over 25, as sole teacher I think male teachers are better. Female teachers are not so good in the higher standards in large schools; they are not able to discharge the work of Standards V., VI., and VII. in the same manner as male teachers. Then, again, male teachers are practically employed permanently, while female teachers are not; and the cost of production of a male teacher is less than the cost of production of a female teacher. In the last two years twenty-two teachers left our service, and of these only five were male teachers—and they were not the best; the other seventeen were female teachers, and some of the best teachers we had. Of these seventeen teachers, six got married, nine left the service altogether, and the other two have been lost sight of. Of sixteen pupil-teachers who have finished their apprenticeship in the last six years—four males and twelve females—the four males are still in our employ, but eight of the females have left. Thus you will see we have retained only one-third of the female pupil-teachers we have trained. Statistics will show that female teachers are very frequently ill. During the last two years we had eighteen cases for absence on sick-leave, and fifteen of these were female teachers. In regard to the other three, I think two of them were teachers who were absent through accidents, and we thus had only one male teacher absent on account of sickness. We have forty schools that were worked at a loss last year, and twenty-five were worked at a gain. Only ten out of the twenty-five were worked at a profit of £50 or over. Speaking of side-schools, I may say we have only one side-school here. The Courtenay Street School is not a side-school, it is the infant department of the central school. I think it is desirable that the infants should be separated from the large schools; in my opinion, it is advisable to give them shorter lessons and more frequent intervals. In conclusion, I might say that I recognise that it is much easier to criticize than to create, and therefore I feel considerable diffidence in criticizing the proposed scale. I think the outcome, whether that scale is carried as it is or in a modified form, will be of the greatest advantage to this district, and to other districts similarly situated, and it will tend to allay the justifiable discontent that exists among our teachers, who at the present time are receiving inadequate pay for the services they render. Besides this, it will raise the status of the teachers all round.

201. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] What educational districts are you acquainted with?—I have been in Otago, and I was inspecting in Wanganui about four years.

202. I see you dealt somewhat fully with the importance of the positions of the first and second male assistants, but you did not allude much to the positions of head-teachers of country schools: at what point would you consider the work of a head-teacher of a country school is equal to that of a first male assistant in a town school?—It is rather a difficult question to answer off-hand; but I should say, in a country school with an attendance between 60 and 70.

203. You consider that a head-teacher in charge of a school with an attendance of 60 or 70 should receive a salary equivalent to the salary paid to the first assistant in a large town school?—I think that is the logical reasoning.

204. I suppose you are aware your Board does not pay anything like an equal salary under such circumstances?—Yes.

205. You consider that in respect to those salaries there is too great a disparity?—Yes.

206. You consider that the work of a head-teacher in a country school of 60 or 70 pupils is quite as arduous and responsible as the work of a first male assistant in a large town school?—Yes; a teacher may be fitted for the work of a first assistant in a town school, but to take charge of a country school requires organizing abilities that he may lack. In a school of 90 pupils, with a head-teacher, an assistant, and a pupil-teacher, the man who can control and work that school efficiently is a very good man.

207. Your choice in the selection of teachers is limited just now?—Yes.

208. Are you satisfied with the staffing under the proposed scale?—I think so; though if the scale were carried into effect there would be an increased demand for assistants throughout the colony, and there might be a difficulty in reducing the number of pupil-teachers.

209. If you offer higher salaries will you not have a larger number of applications from outside educational districts?—Yes.

210. Do you give outside teachers equal chances, in the matter of appointments, with teachers in your own district?—Yes; but, all things being equal, I think preference should be given to the teachers within our own district.

211. You raise the figures and the classification of teachers by an increase of marks?—Yes.

212. How many teachers do you think have been raised during the past twelve months?—I could not say; probably fifteen.

213. Are you aware that during the year 1898, in Otago, only one teacher was increased, and in 1899 only four?—I am not aware of it.

214. On the face of it, would it not appear that there are more increases given in the smaller education districts?—No, I do not think such is the case; of course, sometimes bigger increases may be given in certain districts.

215. Teachers are allowed to take three subjects to rise in degree: would you be in favour of raising those subjects and allow them to be taken yearly—say, in two years?—I hardly think so; though it is not a question I have given much thought to, as it concerns university authorities.

216. Have you thought out any plan of superannuation: do you think that under the alternative scheme teachers could afford to pay something out of their salaries towards a superannuation fund?—Yes, I think so.

217. In the matter of promotions, do you think a better system could be devised?—I am satisfied the difficulty comes in through having two appointing bodies. A Board may go through a list of applicants, carefully considering the qualifications of each of the candidates, and send the names on to the Committee, but the Committee may choose the bottom name on the list.

218. Do you think that is a bad system?—I should like to see a limited number of names sent on to Committees.

219. Have you thought out any system whereby a teacher may have some hope of promotion by reason of merit?—As far as this Board is concerned, appointments do go on merit.

220. Do the Committee have the right to select an appointee subject to the Board's confirmation?—Yes.

221. What do you consider should be the minimum wage fixed for male and female teachers in schools of, say, an average attendance of 25 pupils?—I am satisfied with the scale payment; I should say not less than £90.

222. In such a school would you pay a male and a female the same salary?—I think so, for, as I said, they do equally good work; of course, we get so few chances to put good male teachers in this class of school.

223. Do you think a good male teacher in a school of 20 pupils would do better than a female teacher, assuming they held the same certificates?—Yes, I think so.

224. What percentage of difference would you make in the payment of male and female teachers?—I do not know; I should not like to express it as a percentage.

225. Would you make a differentiation in the payments to married and single teachers?—No.

226. Where the country is open and the roads are good, would you be inclined to extend the area of compulsory attendance beyond two miles?—Yes; of course, there is the question of facilities. Generally, where the roads are good, I should extend the area half a mile, making it two miles and a half.

227. Would you increase the number of attendances?—Yes; but an attendance should be defined, which it is not at present.

228. You wish to see the remuneration of teachers built up to the highest standard obtaining in the country at the present time?—Yes, if the country can stand it.

229. If the £4 capitation grant was not sufficient, do you think the Government should be asked to go beyond that in order to bring the salaries up to the highest level paid in the colony at the present time?—I do not know what the highest standard is, but I think a certain reduction might have to take place in the higher centres.

230. Do you mean a reduction in the salaries paid in the larger centres?—Yes, though it may appear a little inconsistent to say so.

231. You say there is not sufficient inducement to induce bright lads to enter the teaching profession?—Yes.

232. Then, do you not think your proposal would still act against them—*i.e.*, do you think, in the face of that, that it would be wise to reduce the highest salaries?—I merely meant it was necessary to equalise the salaries all round.

233. Then, on reconsidering your question, are you still of the opinion that you would reduce the higher salaries?—If it is the alternative between unequal salaries and lowering them to bring about equality, by all means let us have equality.

234. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you approve of the proposed capitation grant of £5 a head to all schools having an average attendance under 14 pupils?—I do not see any other way in which to work those small schools.

235. Taking the first group of schools under the alternative scale, with an average attendance from 14 to 19, have you noticed that the salary ranges from £80 to £100?—Yes.

236. That is the minimum salary?—Yes.

237. And those proposed salaries are the same for both sexes?—Yes.

238. Do you consider that is a fair thing?—Yes, I consider that it is a very fair thing.

239. And only after the standard of a living-wage is reached would you differentiate the salaries paid to male and female teachers?—Yes.

240. You consider that a salary of £100 is a living-wage?—Yes.

241. And beyond that wage you think it is just and fair that a difference should be made in the salaries paid to male and female teachers?—I think so.

242. What is your opinion as to the introduction of a certificated mistress when the average attendance of a school reaches 40?—I think it is highly desirable, and that it will make a school of that class very easy to work.

243. You think that is the best form of assistance that could be given at that stage?—Yes, for it means that at times the average attendance of such a school would be considerably over 40.

244. You consider that to strengthen the staff in that manner would be in the direction of increased efficiency in the management and working of the school?—Certainly, I do.

245. I understand you to say that you are perfectly satisfied with the suggested salaries, that they are fairly liberal, and a considerable increase on the salaries paid in this district at the present time?—Yes, that is so; sixty-six of our teachers get increases.

246. I understand that the number of pupil-teachers in your district would be reduced by nineteen: do you think that is desirable in the interests of education?—Yes; we do not think it will be detrimental to the interests of this district if we gain in certificated assistants.

247. You gain seventeen certificated teachers in their place?—Yes.

248. Do you think it is better for the schools that you should have more assistant teachers than pupil-teachers?—Undoubtedly.

249. Have you considered the question of the required certificate for the various grades of schools?—Yes.

250. Looking at the first grade, with an average attendance between 14 and 19 pupils, the required certificate is E5: do you not think it would be better to make that certificate E4?—No, I do not think so; it depends on how marks are assigned.

251. Taking the next grade, do you not think an E2 is too high?—Yes; I would suggest an E3.

252. And the next grade, 35 to 75, D2 is required: what would you suggest?—I think an E2 would be sufficient.

253. And the next grade again, 75 to 100: does not D1 appear somewhat high?—Yes; I think D2 or E1 would be sufficient.

254. Taking that group of schools with an attendance ranging from 250 to 600, do you not think C1 for a headmaster is somewhat high?—Yes, I think it is for that class of schools.

255. Do you not think C1 high enough for any grade of primary schools?—Yes, I think so.

256. You do not think B1 is too high a classification for the highest grade of schools?—No, I do not think so.

257. Would you penalise a man holding a C1 certificate when a B1 is required?—I do not look upon them as deductions; I look upon them as bonuses deducted instead of added; it is a question of subtraction instead of addition.

258. Have you many country teachers in Taranaki holding a C certificate or higher certificate?—Three or four.

259. Do you think opportunity should be given to country-school teachers to obtain a C certificate by taking one subject annually?—Yes.

260. You think every possible encouragement should be given to male and female country teachers to obtain a C certificate?—Yes.

261. And, considering the amount of work involved, you think they should be allowed to take one subject at a time?—Yes.

262. Have you considered the staffing in the largest of your schools?—Yes.

263. On the whole, you strongly approve of a uniform scale of the staff and salaries for the schools throughout the colony?—Yes.

264. Supposing Inspectors were placed under the central department, would it not be possible to have such regulations that, although Inspectors were paid by the department and under the control of the department, they would be available to the Boards as at present, in order that the Boards might obtain from the Inspectors the advice they would be able to give upon educational subjects under consideration?—It would depend, of course, on the regulations framed by the department.

265. *Mr. Stewart.*] Putting aside the interests of the teachers altogether, are you of opinion that the adoption of a colonial scale would be a public benefit?—Yes, if a colonial scale of salaries means added remuneration for the important work a teacher has to do.

266. You are also of the opinion that the staffing in the suggested scheme, which is laid on the table for our consideration, is a great improvement on your present system of staffing?—Yes, a great improvement.

267. Do you think it would be a wise thing to calculate the average of the school per annum instead of per quarter?—I think it would mean greater stability to do so.

268. Which do you think the more difficult to obtain in a teacher—special fitness in order to carry on large classes in schools, or to organize and conduct a moderately sized country school?—It depends on the teacher.

269. Yes; but which do you think is the rarer gift—special fitness in the organization and management of a large class in a town school or conducting a medium-sized country school?—Well, of course, it is a question of quality and not quantity. One man requires a certain qualification, and another something else. I think it is more difficult, however, to obtain a man with the qualifications necessary in the organization of a school.

270. *Mr. Luke.*] Are you sole Inspector for this educational district?—Yes.

271. With reference to the cost of living in different educational districts in the colony, do you think that difference should be a factor in determining a colonial scale?—No, I do not; I think it is only in the matter of house-rent that there is any great variation.

272. In the matter of appointments, does the Taranaki Education Board send a certain number of names to the Committees to choose from?—No; there is no fixed number.

273. Do you not think it would be better that a minimum number should be sent—say, three, four, or five names—and that the Committee should keep to them?—Yes, I think so.

274. Have you any aided schools in this district?—No; and we have no definite regulations in regard to them. We have a side-school.

275. Do you find half-time schools answer here?—We have none. There is only the question of cheapness to recommend them.

276. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Are the school-buildings in this district adapted for increased staffing—for example, country schools with an attendance of from 30 to 50, and with a head-teacher and an assistant, are the buildings sufficiently large to enable these two teachers to carry on the work satisfactorily?—Most of them are sufficiently large, up to an attendance of 50.

277. With regard to the centralisation of the inspectorate, I suppose you are aware a resolution was carried at the Inspectors' Conference favouring that movement?—Yes.

278. Do you consider that the suggested salaries to be paid to pupil-teachers are ample?—Yes, with the exception of the salary of a first-year pupil-teacher. I think £20 is too little, and would suggest £25.

279. £25, and an allowance of £10 when away from home?—Yes; I think the introduction of an allowance such as that is a very good point in the scheme.

280. Do you think the extra increase of capitation amounting to 5s. *per capita* would prove of any material advantage in a district like Taranaki?—It would give us about £800 more; it is not anything like equal to what is proposed under the scale

281. A colonial scale would prove far more beneficial than the extra grant of 5s. per head?—Yes, very much more beneficial.

282. *Mr. Hilt.*] What is the staffing of your main school?—Since I was there I think there has been an alteration.

283. So far as you know, who was in charge of Standard VI., a male or female teacher?—Last year a female teacher.

284. Who had charge of Standard V.?—A male teacher.

285. And Standard IV.?—A male teacher.

286. Standard III.?—A female teacher.

287. Standard II.?—Two pupil-teachers, I think.

288. Standard I.?—Pupil-teachers.

289. Have you only four assistant teachers at that school?—The infant department is in charge of a mistress.

290. You consider her really as being an assistant?—Yes—first female assistant.

291. What is the attendance of the school?—I think the average attendance for the last quarter was 483.

292. Was that staffing arranged by the headmaster, and did it meet with your approval?—It was not satisfactory to either the headmaster or myself, but, owing to the exigencies in regard to the size of the standards, there was no help for it.

293. How many pupils were there in Standard VI.?—20 to 25.

294. And how many in Standard V.?—40 to 50.

295. What certificate did the female teacher hold?—D1.

296. As she was in charge of Standard VI., what salary did she receive?—I could not say exactly; I think it would be £110; last year it was £105.

297. What salary did the assistant master in charge of Standard V. receive?—£200.

298. What certificate did he hold?—D2.

299. The female teacher in charge of Standard VI. was classed higher than the male teacher in charge of Standard V., though she received very much less salary?—Yes; she was the third female assistant; she was only put in charge of Standard VI. in a case of emergency, not as a regular thing.

300. You recognise that the headmaster had the right to remove teachers from class to class, according to his judgment, and to meet exigencies that might arise?—Yes. The arrangement he made in regard to this female assistant was not one he would approve of as a regular thing. It was the size of the classes and the size of the class-rooms that brought about such an abnormal arrangement.

301. Which do you consider the most important standard in the school?—Standard VI.

302. Do you think that the headmaster put the female teacher in charge of that standard, knowing that she could not do the work?—That is hardly a fair question to ask.

303. Do you not think there should be a closer approximation in the salaries of the teachers?—Not under these conditions. The infant mistress should get a close approximation to the salary of the second male assistant or the first female assistant.

304. You mean to say that in regard to salaries there should be a closer approximation between the first assistant mistress and the first assistant master?—Well, yes; with the balance in favour of the first assistant male teacher.

305. And the same thing to apply in the case of the second and third male and female assistants?—I put the first assistant female on the same footing as the second male assistant in schools like we have up to an attendance of 400; possibly she should be paid a shade higher than the second male assistant.

306. Going back to a school with an average attendance of 50, do you think that the head-teacher of such a school should get a salary equal to the salary paid to a first assistant master in a large town school?—Speaking roughly, I think the head-teacher of a school with an average attendance of about 70 should be on the same footing as a first assistant male in a school with an attendance of about 400 or 500; perhaps I should speak in regard to our own schools.

307. Do you find that female teachers in small schools carry out their duties and perform their work as efficiently as would male teachers?—Yes, up to a certain point.

308. In schools, say, with an attendance up to 25, is that so?—Yes.

309. Would you suggest, in the construction of a scale, that females, as far as possible, should be employed in schools with an average attendance below 30?—No.

310. Why not?—Because it means so many changes; there would be a constant change from a male to a female, and from a female to a male.

311. You would assume a School Committee or Board would change a teacher who has given satisfaction, because the attendance reached a certain number?—If not, I do not see any points in making such a scheme, because it can be done now; if a school gets too heavy for a female teacher she can be shifted, and a male teacher appointed. I would limit by the capacity of the teacher; if a female teacher is capable of carrying on a school of 60, let her do so.

312. What is the limit at which assistance would be given?—When the attendance reaches 40.

313. Would you allow a male or a female to take charge of a school up to 40?—I would give assistance at 40, whether a male or female was in charge of the school.

314. Under such conditions, would you pay a female teacher the same salary as a male teacher?—No.

315. Why not, if you require the same standard of work from each?—I would not give the same salary after the standard of a living-wage is reached, for reasons previously stated.

316. What do you call a living-wage?—What a man can live on, in the ordinary sense of the term, with ordinary comfort.

317. If you differentiate in the salaries, would not women be appointed to those schools as the cheaper article?—I do not think so; we always try to get the best teacher.

318. Do you approve of the present mode of classifying teachers?—Yes.

319. Do you think that the A men and the B men are the best teachers?—Other things being equal, I think they are better.

320. In the selection of teachers do you prefer mental attainments or technical skill?—I prefer technical skill.

321. I suppose you are aware that there is only one class of certificate issued in England?—No, I am not.

322. Do you not think one class of certificate would be preferable in New Zealand?—No.

323. You think that the present system is the better one?—I do.

324. *Mr. Smith.*] Have you any idea as to the difference in the cost of living in your district—the percentage between the highest and the lowest?—No; I do not think there is a great difference. There are compensating advantages in the town, and *vice versâ*.

325. Would the difference be as much as 5 per cent., do you think?—Not if a free house were provided.

326. In regard to giving marks for proficiency in teachers, do you ever give a highest number of marks—speaking in regard to your district—to a teacher who has never had charge of a school?—Yes, if I am satisfied that he is capable of taking charge of a school.

327. *Mr. Weston.*] I think you said you would give a teacher any number of pupils, so long as he or she could manage them efficiently?—When I said that I was referring to a sole teacher in a small country school.

328. That being so, do you not think it is a circumstance that we should take into consideration when we are asked to form a hard-and-fast scale for the colony, which would render it absolutely necessary to appoint an assistant in schools when the attendance reaches 40?—No, I think not.

329. Then, if that be not a circumstance, are you wise in your remark that you would allow a teacher 60 pupils if he or she were competent to manage them?—In a country school of 40, at which point an assistant should be appointed, I do not for one moment mean that the teacher in charge of the school should continue with the increased attendance and not get assistance.

330. I understood you to say that if a teacher could carry on efficiently with 60 pupils you would not disturb that teacher by giving assistance?—No, I do not mean that.

331. If you had meant that, would you not have cut away the bottom of the colonial scale?—Yes, I admit that.

332. I think I understood you to say that in the Central School here the First and Second Standards are taught by pupil-teachers?—Yes.

333. Do you think that is a sound principle?—No.

334. Then, why is it pursued in that particular school?—It does not obtain now, and was done only once in six years, owing, as I said, to the exigencies of the class-rooms and the size of the standards.

335. You do not advocate leaving classes in the hands of pupil-teachers?—No.

336. Do I understand that many of the male pupil-teachers are leaving the service?—That is not so; within the last four years four boys completed their course of apprenticeship, and not one of them has left our service.

337. Does that same remark apply to the female teachers?—No; two-thirds of them have left our service—eight out of twelve.

338. Do you think that pupil-teachers in the schools are overworked?—No, I do not think so, though they are hard-worked.

339. Have they time for study?—Not during school-hours.

340. Do you consider that pupil-teachers should be allowed to study after school-hours?—Yes; I believe in a certain amount of night-work.

341. How would you divide the day?—Let the pupil-teachers work four hours a day. The instruction given them by the head-teacher is out of school-hours; I should like it to be given in school-hours.

342. In regard to certificates, do you think that the highest certificates should be expected from teachers who apply for the higher positions?—Yes.

343. Do you believe in the introduction of manual and technical instruction in the primary schools?—I believe in manual only, and technical perhaps in the higher schools. I think manual instruction is as necessary to the children as reading, writing, and arithmetic; it is the training of the hand, not so much that you are going to fit them for any department in life.

344. If you eliminate subjects from the syllabus, will not the children be deprived of acquiring knowledge upon some subjects that must of necessity be useful to them?—I do not think so, and I am of the opinion that manual instruction is going to be of the greatest use to them.

345. Do you think that manual and technical instruction should be encouraged by elimination from the syllabus of other subjects?—No, not by elimination.

346. Do you think that pupil-teachers in the schools in your district can be thoroughly trained for the profession?—Yes; I think they are receiving very good instruction.

347. Are they receiving such instruction as will enable them to become good teachers?—Yes; though it may be improved.

348. How may it be improved?—As I suggested before, by a grant for school-management; by Saturday lectures, given by some one well qualified.

349. Are there ladies and gentlemen in this district who by training and education are qualified to impart that knowledge?—Yes.

350. Could you safely say, then, that a training-school would be unnecessary in this district?—No; I do not say that, by any means.

351. *The Chairman.*] You would not object to a university?—No, certainly not.

352. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you think that the present system of education, *plus* the instruction you say could be given in this district to pupil-teachers, would enable those pupil-teachers to stand side by side with pupil-teachers trained in Canterbury or Otago, where there are special training-schools?—I think there is a very close approximation in their work.

353. Are not relieving-teachers required for this district?—We have no permanent relieving-teachers.

354. What is your system of appointing teachers to take the place of those who may be away sick?—We practically take any one available.

355. Do you find that sufficient: why have you no relieving staff?—It is a question of expense.

356. Would you advocate the establishment of more training-colleges in New Zealand?—Yes.

357. *Mr. Hogben.*] Did I understand you to say that you thought there would be a difficulty under the proposed colonial scale in obtaining the additional assistants who would be required?—It seems to me so. Where are the four hundred assistants to come from?

358. You are aware that there are a certain number of efficient teachers out of employment?—Yes.

359. Would it meet your point if four years were allowed for transition from the old system to the new?—I think it perhaps would be inexpedient to fix any time-limit.

360. Would it not be fair to allow Boards four years in which to work into the system?—Yes, I think it would; in fact, I should be inclined to say five, because you can never foresee everything.

361. Would you say five years as the extreme limit?—Yes.

362. I think I understood you to say that no scheme should be brought forward unless accompanied by a superannuation scheme?—I think I said that no scheme would be complete without the introduction also of a superannuation scheme.

363. Would you put a colonial scale of salaries first in the logical order?—Yes.

364. First in importance and logical order?—Yes.

365. You think a uniform scale should be followed by a superannuation scheme?—Yes, I think so, very strongly; I think Inspectors should be included also.

366. I suppose you think such a scheme would be easier if a colonial scale of salaries was first drawn up?—Yes.

367. Would you be in favour of a simplification of the certificates, a smaller number of classes and a smaller number of divisions than at present?—No; I think the present system has answered admirably.

368. With regard to relieving-teachers: if Boards were to pay relieving-teachers, would that not meet the exigencies of sick-leave?—Yes.

369. Would you be in a position to say how many relieving-teachers would be required in this district on the average?—I think an analysis of the amount of sick-leave granted would show how many relieving-teachers would be required.

370. With regard to Boards' expenses, you are of opinion that a graduated scale would suit best, or, at all events, would suit the Board in this district?—Yes, I think so.

371. Referring again to certificates, do you think it would be an advantage to leave the question of certificates out of the scale altogether?—No; I think it would be a distinct disadvantage.

372. I simply mean leaving them out of the scale; I do not mean that there should be no certificates?—I understand; but I think one of the best points in the scheme is the cognisance taken of certificates. For this reason it is a system of bonuses and an encouragement for teachers to improve their status.

373. *The Chairman.*] If you had two applications for an important position, one holding an A certificate and with high literary attainments but very little experience in school-management, and the other holding a D certificate and with considerable experience in teaching and in school-management, which of the two would you appoint?—The teacher holding the D certificate.

374. That is to say, you would give preference to an experienced teacher with a low certificate over a university man with a high certificate but no practical experience?—Yes.

375. Do you think it is desirable to introduce an innovation that would beyond the remotest doubt place the older, experienced, and most competent teachers at a serious disadvantage in applying for situations, by penalising them on account of deficiencies in their certificates?—I do not think it would place them at a disadvantage. Although a certain certificate is required, it does not follow that the holder of that certificate will get the appointment. A Board will consider the best teacher for that position, and will put his or her name at the top of the list to be forwarded to Committees.

376. Does not the Board generally consider the letter as well as the figure: would the Board not place a teacher holding a B1 certificate before a teacher holding a C1, in the matter of an appointment?—Yes.

377. Do not teachers holding D1 certificates predominate in our schools, and do they not hold the best positions also?—Yes; but, though their certificates may be D1, there are many men with the very highest qualifications.

378. I understand you do not attach so much importance, after all, to the literary qualification?—Of course, the best teacher is the skilled teacher.

379. You do not mean to say for a moment that we require university professors to teach primary education in the Sixth and Seventh Standards, and in the small country schools?—No, of course not.

380. Then, you put literary attainments in the background, and place experience and skill to the fore?—Yes.

381. With regard to the system of education in this district, do you think it is fairly satisfactory?—Satisfactory in this way: that I think it has improved.

382. Do you think the proposed increase in capitation of 5s. per head will be sufficient for the proposed staffing of the schools in this district?—No.

383. Do you think it could be done on an increased capitation allowance of £1?—Yes, I believe it could.

384. Do you think that you have too many small schools in this district—that they have increased materially of late years?—Yes; I think they have considerably, though I think there are only two cases where the schools could be done away with, and even then it would entail great hardship on a number of children.

385. Does the Board consult you, or make any inquiry into the necessities of different localities?—I do not know always what is done; there is a committee to inquire into these things.

386. Are you consulted yourself, or expected to furnish a report?—Not always; in some cases I may not know anything of what is going on.

387. With regard to the average attendance, what class of schools generally suffers through irregularity of the children—the town or country schools?—The country schools, owing to bad roads.

388. Do you think the improvement of the roads would be better than the employment of a Truant Inspector?—I think you need a Truant Inspector as well as good roads.

389. It is proposed to reduce the number of pupil-teachers not only in this district, but throughout the colony, in order to increase salaries: do you think that will be an advantage?—If there is no scarcity of assistants to fill the positions, then I think it would be an advantage to decrease the number of pupil-teachers.

390. Is the supply of pupil-teachers large enough to insure plenty of applications for vacancies?—Not in this district.

391. Would not the reduction of pupil-teachers in your district have an injurious effect on the schools?—No; I think that would be counterbalanced by an increase of salaries.

392. Do you think it would be judicious to reduce the number of pupil-teachers throughout the colony in order to increase the salaries of our adult teachers?—No; but if we are producing a supply of pupil-teachers for whom we cannot find employment, then we are wasting four years of the best part of their lives; and, as I said, I do not think a reduction in the number of pupil-teachers would have an injurious effect upon the district, because the increased salary would induce more applications.

393. Do you get a supply of good material for pupil-teachers?—Yes.

394. Do you think there could be an improvement in the material supplied?—Yes.

395. What is your opinion as to the reason many of the pupil-teachers—female pupil-teachers—leave the profession?—To get married, I suppose.

396. Is that invariably the case?—During the last two years, out of seventeen female teachers, six left to get married, nine left the service altogether, and I think two of them are still teaching.

397. Supposing they had fair and reasonable opportunities of earning large salaries, the same as male teachers, do you think they would have left the profession?—Yes, I think so.

398. Have you any difficulty in filling positions carrying a salary of £150 a year and upwards?—No.

399. Do you think there is a danger of female labour competing for those positions?—No, I do not think so.

400. If equal pay for equal work prevailed, and no difference whatever was made between the sexes, in the matter of employment, do you think any injury would arise to male teachers—married men with families?—Yes, I think so.

401. In what way?—It would injure the chances of married male teachers with families if women were paid equally well, because there would be greater competition and less chances of employment.

402. Would it not be more harmful in the other direction—that is to say, if women were paid inferior salaries, would not the paymasters employ the cheaper labour, with detrimental results to married male teachers?—No, I do not think so.

403. Is it not in accordance with human nature that cheap labour is preferred?—I think the Boards would consider the best applications apart from the question of cheapness.

404. Would Committees prefer single women to married men with families, some of whom would augment the school-attendance?—Very often the female teacher is preferred.

405. Have you ever known a case where a female teacher under such conditions was preferred?—A number of them.

406. Where the man was equally capable with the woman so far as educational qualifications were concerned?—Yes.

407. Have such cases happened in this district?—Yes.

FRIDAY, 7TH JUNE, 1901.

P. S. WHITCOMBE, Secretary of the Taranaki Education Board, examined.

408. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you think it necessary to have twenty-six meetings of your Board every year?—I believe it is to keep the work properly up.

409. Has your Chairman not authority to do a good deal of work on his own responsibility?—No.

410. But does he not dismiss a teacher for bad conduct?—No.

411. Nor fill vacancies on his own motion?—Temporary vacancies, he does.

412. *Mr. Davidson.*] You pay your teachers according to a scale drawn up by your Board?—Yes.

413. If you were to receive the money from the department in the same way, but to pay teachers according to a uniform scale, would it in any way weaken the control of the Board over its teachers?—I do not think it would weaken the control of the Board.

414. Have you seen the suggested colonial scale?—Yes.

415. In your opinion, would that tend to improve the position of teachers materially in this district?—Yes.

416. Then, you approve of the colonial scale of staffing and salaries?—Yes.

417. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the suggested scale with the scale that obtains in this district?—To a certain extent I have.

418. Does it materially benefit the teachers of the Taranaki District?—I think, in every case except assistant teachers.

419. Did you compare the salaries paid to assistants in North Canterbury or Otago?—No.

420. Supposing the suggested scale made provision for the payment of assistants in Taranaki on a scale equal to that paid for North Canterbury or Otago, would that benefit Taranaki?—Yes, I think so, for the teachers of these districts are better paid than those of Taranaki.

421. Do you experience difficulty in filling up vacancies in small schools?—Yes.

422. Do teachers leave Taranaki?—I have heard of a few assistants going away, but no others.

423. Is there a tendency on the part of the teachers to gravitate towards the town?—Yes; to get tuition.

424. Do you find that those who do get into the towns take advantage of that opportunity to improve their certificate?—Yes, in some cases I have known it done; but there are so few opportunities of getting into town.

425. Does your Board give facilities for transferring teachers from one part of the district to another?—Very poor facilities; I think in that respect an improvement is necessary.

426. Are you aware that in other districts facilities are given for transfer?—No, I have not heard that.

427. It would give a better opportunity for promotion if we had a colonial scale, and it were laid down that one education district might transfer to another district in the event of teachers desiring a transfer?—Yes, I think so. There is a difficulty at present, because Committees have so much say in the matter of promotions.

428. Do you think it should be defined by the Legislature what the functions of the Board and the Committees should be in the appointment of teachers?—Yes; but I do not think Committees should have any say in the appointment of teachers.

429. Do you consider that the minimum certificate as laid down in this suggested scale is too high?—I do not feel myself competent to give an opinion.

430. With regard to certificates, does your Board give preference to those candidates or applicants for positions who have the highest certificates?—All things being equal, I think so; but an endeavour is always made to find out all about a teacher's success in previous positions before making an appointment.

431. All things being equal, you think that preference should be given to the highest certificate?—Yes.

432. Would you favour a scheme of superannuation for teachers who have grown old in the service?—Yes.

433. With regard to the payment of female teachers in the Taranaki District, you do not give the same salaries as to male teachers?—No.

434. If you did give the same salaries, would it not to a great extent lead to the exclusion of female applicants? Do you not give females the preference now for pecuniary reasons?—I do not think so. I think, in all the smaller schools, males and females should receive the same salaries up to a certain limit.

435. Do you consider that a female teacher can teach up to the Fourth Standard as efficiently as a male teacher?—I have no experience that would enable me to decide.

436. With regard to the separation of the sexes in the larger schools, do you favour or oppose the separation which takes place in Wellington and some parts of Canterbury?—No; I think things work very comfortably as they are.

437. Would you support a system whereby the brighter pupils in our primary schools might, by bursaries, exhibitions, and scholarships, be enabled to pass through the secondary schools and universities, so that the brightest pupils of the poorest parents might get the fullest benefit of the education system?—Yes.

438. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you pay your salaries through the School Committees or direct?—Direct.

439. Under the proposed colonial scale, would the gross amount payable to teachers in Taranaki be higher or lower than the gross amount you pay now?—In the case of the Central School it would be lower, or just about the same.

440. Is not the staffing more generous than your staffing at the present time?—I think it makes a difference of one.

441. Supposing other districts were to suffer for the sake of your district, would you approve of the scheme then?—I should, if I considered that according to that scale fair salaries were paid, and if in other districts the salaries were too high. It would be no hardship in their case to be reduced to the level of the colonial scale, which I consider a fair one.

442. Do you think that the amount of 11s. 3d. will be sufficient for you, district for maintenance?—No, I do not think it would be. It should be worked on a sliding-scale, and on the number of schools in the district—the largest district getting, say, 10s., and the smallest district so-much more.

443. *Mr. Hogben.*] Will you furnish the Commission with a statement of the expenditure of your Board for the three years 1898, 1899, and 1900, of all such items of administration as are payable out of the capitation grant?—Yes.

444. I think you said that the proposed colonial scale would not benefit some of the assistant teachers. I do not know whether you are aware that in laying the alternative scheme before the Commission I suggested that the amount saved by the more reduced staffing could be devoted to raising the salaries of all assistants, male and female, in all the schools throughout the colony, to the highest existing scale?—I was not aware of that.

445. Teachers here would be satisfied if they were brought up to the level of the Otago scale?—Yes.

446. *The Chairman.*] Have you any reason to believe that you have an inferior class of teachers in Taranaki to those in other parts of New Zealand where the salaries are better?—No.

447. Assuming that you allow the central department to become the paymaster, and that the Boards are allowed to retain the privilege of making appointments, and also of making schools where they think them to be necessary, do you think conflict between the Board and the central department could possibly be avoided at times?—The central department by making the colonial scale would do away with the Board's function as paymaster.

448. Do you think that the colony will be able to stand the strain of the increased expenditure on education?—I have not heard it suggested that there will be any disturbance or friction over the increased salaries.

449. Are there good grounds why the Board should not be the distributing body?—It will be the distributing body.

450. Is there any reason for having a colonial scale of staffs and salaries? Is there not stronger reason why the teachers themselves should be placed under, and appointments made from, the central department?—No; because I think the Boards know the requirements of the various districts.

451. Do you believe in the central body having control of the Inspectors?—No; I think the Inspector gets a knowledge of one district, and I think it is to the interest of that district to retain him.

452. Do you think that a colonial scale is as much demanded as better pay for teachers, particularly for those in charge of small schools?—It would not do for one district to be able to pay teachers higher salaries than another district can pay, and a colonial scale does away with that.

453. Outside the profession, have you heard any demand for a colonial scale?—No.

454. Is there a demand on the part of parents that there should be a colonial scale?—I have not heard of their taking much interest in the salaries of teachers.

E. G. ALLSWORTH, Member of the Taranaki Education Board, examined.

Mr. Allsworth: I may say that it is quite a truism in Taranaki that every one is in favour of a colonial scale, for the reason that within Taranaki we have been so starved that anything that will improve the position of teachers will find favour not only with teachers, but with the whole community. But when we come to deal with the question of framing a colonial scale it opens up a large question, and one in which I see greater difficulties than I anticipated since hearing the evidence yesterday. I take it that the difficulty we are anxious to deal with is to increase the pay of our teachers—or, rather, to equalise the pay of our teachers—and at the same time not increase the colonial expenditure. Whether we can do that or not is a question, I take it, that this Commission will have to decide. If we had plenty of money the thing is as easy as possible. In Taranaki we have a certain sum of money placed before us, and we have to give our salaries in accordance with it. We are in the unfortunate position of having, perhaps, fewer large schools than any other district in New Zealand, and a large number of small ones; and we have to divide this money with what we believe to be as near a sense of justice as we can arrive at. At the same time our teachers, who we consider are as good as any teachers in any other part of the colony, are largely handicapped. It appears to me that the departmental view is to secure efficiency at the lowest possible cost consistent with the grant of a living-wage. From the teachers' standpoint it is important that they shall have freedom of promotion, security of position, and equal pay for equal work. Another important feature, I think, is that there should be a superannuation scheme. I am strongly in favour of both Inspectors and teachers being placed under the department. I think that would do away with a great deal of the friction that at present exists, and lead to greater efficiency in the work. It would free both teachers and Inspectors from a great many difficulties they have to labour under at the present time, not because of any desire on the part of the local authorities to hamper them, but from want of knowledge of the technical duties of their position. I think there should be some provision for locally trained pupil-teachers. I should oppose any system that would lead to children of other districts coming into Taranaki, thus debarring any pupils of our schools from becoming teachers and rising in the profession. One difficulty we find here is the cost of the present system. I do not think that one-third of the teachers who start their pupil-teacher course really become teachers. When you consider that it takes four years to complete a pupil-teacher's course you will see that the finished article is very expensive. I am at a loss to know how the cost of training pupil-teachers can be cheapened, while at the same time maintaining efficiency, unless a colonial scale giving greater inducements to teachers is established. A great deal has been said about the cost of living and the difficulty of adjusting a colonial scale to the conditions in different parts of the colony. I do not think the Commission need trouble about that, for the reason that in Taranaki the cost of living varies more than in any other part of New Zealand. We had teachers out in the east of Stratford last winter to whom it cost £20 a ton to get in provisions, and the people were living on fern-roots, so we were told. The position is similar to that of the Post Office, Telegraph, and Railway Offices. If a man is fortunate enough to be transferred to a place where the cost of living is low, he has a good time; and if he is sent to a place where the cost of living is high, he suffers accordingly. It appears to me that in confining your efforts to the question of teachers' salaries the Commission and the Government are simply scratching the surface. What appears to me to be necessary is that the whole of our education system should be gone into, and revolutionised from top to bottom. A great deal of unnecessary expense is involved on this coast by the overlapping of the education districts, which could be more economically worked if the boundaries were readjusted. That would be advantageous both to Taranaki and to Wanganui. I am extremely doubtful whether, under such a scheme as I have in my mind, Education Boards could be continued; but I think there might be brought into operation possibly a modified system of Boards and Committees. In addition to the question of boundaries, there is another very important question that wants to be gone into, and that is the question of higher education. High schools are competing with primary schools, and a waste of money is going on. That ought to be looked into and remedied. I think, if a Council of Education could be instituted, consisting partly of elected members and partly of nominated members, it would be a great advantage to the Minister in dealing with the question of education, and would take away a great deal of the friction at present existing.

455. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Would it help you, do you think, if you were united with Wanganui?—I am afraid the district then would be too large.

456. Would the Council of Education that you suggest be a sort of colonial council from all parts of the colony, or elected from any part?—I should say, elected from all parts of the colony.

457. A kind of colonial Advisory Board of Education?—Yes.

458. Do you think that under central control teachers could be better handled than by the Boards: do you think the department would have that local knowledge which is essential?—That would depend on the nature of the Boards or Committees selected to supply the department with information.

459. You say you would not like to see your pupil-teachers displaced by others, but under this colonial scale do you not think that the question of locality would largely become a thing of the past?—Not so far as affording an opportunity for any pupil of the district to become a pupil-teacher.

460. Do you think it is necessary for your Board to have twenty-six meetings in the year?—I do not think so; I have tried to reduce the number, but have been unsuccessful.

461. Have you thought out any system of promotion that would be fairly just to teachers?—The only way to do it, that I can see, is to place teachers under a central authority, and let them

work out a system of promotion. Personally, I am opposed to the present system of letters and figures in the certificates, and I think that promotion should be made on teaching ability.

462. *Mr. Davidson.*] I understand you to say that under any national system of education we should have a uniform colonial scale of staffing: what scale of staffing would you propose?—That is very difficult to answer, because there are sometimes local circumstances which prevent adherence to a strict rule.

463. If the schools of the colony were staffed on a scale according to average attendance, would there be any more difficulty in staffing them according to a uniform scale?—Yes; in carrying out a colonial scheme I do not think there could be allowed the same amount of latitude that is now allowed.

464. Under properly drawn-up regulations, could not just as much latitude be allowed as under any other scale?—I think it could be, and that is where I think the Council of Education would be useful.

465. But if this Commission were to suggest a colonial scale of staffing and formulate regulations that would allow as much latitude as is now allowed under local scales, would that not meet the case?—It should do.

466. Teachers, you think, working under a national education system should be paid according to a colonial scale of salary?—Yes.

467. Do you note that the Commission is bound to formulate a scheme within a capitation grant of £4?—Well, that only increases its difficulties.

468. If the children in this district had an opportunity, after completing their pupil-teachership course, of entering training schools or colleges, would they not be placed on an equally advantageous footing with those of the larger districts?—I suppose so.

469. You think that the whole system of education wants revolutionising and reforming; but do you not think that that would be made much more possible by a uniform system of salaries?—I think that would make it much easier.

470. Would you be surprised to learn that a great many teachers have expressed a desire to remain under the control of the Boards so long as they get a uniform scale of staffing and salary?—I am not aware of that; but I should say that that refers to districts where they are more highly paid at present.

471. Do you not think that, if the colony were divided into education districts of a proper size, the local authorities would be in a better position to carry out any scheme of promotion than the central department?—That, of course, would depend very greatly on the system under which they were working.

472. If a colonial scheme were framed, and the administration of it put in the hands of the Boards, do you not think that would be preferable to its being administered by the central department?—I do not see what they would be able to do. They would be tied down, and only able to proceed in a certain direction; and it appears to me that the department could carry out the system with less expense to the country.

473. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think that your teachers are satisfied with the present position of affairs in regard to salaries?—No.

474. Do you think it is a good thing for any body of public servants to be in a state of unrest and dissatisfaction?—It is a very bad thing.

475. Do you know of any other colony that has not a colonial scale of payment?—I do not know of one.

476. Is there any body of public servants in the colony that has not a colonial scale of payment?—Not that I am aware of.

477. Do you think there is any real difficulty in the way of the teachers having a colonial scale of payment?—I do not think there ought to be any difficulty.

478. Do you think it would be a good thing for the education of your district if the number of women teachers were to be increased, and, perhaps, the service ultimately be almost entirely officered by women?—I can hardly go that length, but I think that women make most efficient teachers for small schools. In very large schools I think it is preferable to have men for officers.

479. Do you think the general tendency throughout the colony is to drive males out of the profession?—I think if you were to adopt equal payment of the sexes you would drive the females out of the profession.

480. You are of opinion that, whatever change should be made, there should be a colonial scale of staffs and salaries?—Yes.

481. *Mr. Luke.*] You mentioned the question of boundaries: do you not think there might be some arrangement whereby the boundaries of Taranaki and Wanganui could be altered?—I do not know how it could be done, but it would be desirable.

482. You think that the question of public education is one of the most important matters that can come under the consideration of any body of men?—I think it is the most important colonial question any one could deal with.

483. If £4 per head is not sufficient, do you think an extra vote, if asked for and granted by the House of Representatives, would be money well spent?—Money is not well spent when it is unnecessary. If the same ends can be achieved with the expenditure of less money I think it is desirable to reduce it, and I would not like to fix any sum. I should like to see the Commission's powers enlarged to enable it to go into the whole question and see if any extra expenditure is needed.

484. It is for that reason that you favour teachers and Inspectors being placed under the control of the department—you think there would be less expense?—No, not altogether; I think it would be for the greater efficiency of the education service.

485. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to the capitation allowance of £3 15s., do you not consider,—

if the Legislature adopted a colonial scale of salaries, that this capitation would disappear, and that Parliament would only have to vote each year a lump sum for salaries?—Yes, I suppose so.

486. At present the capitation allowance is £3 15s., and it is proposed to raise that to £4; but if a colonial scale of salary is adopted, payment must be made in accordance with that scale independent of capitation?—Certainly.

487. And, consequently, Parliament each year will have to vote a lump sum?—Yes.

488. *Mr. Hill.*] I assume you think if there is to be an increase in the amount of money payable for education it must come out of taxation?—I intended to convey the meaning that I think there is enough money being spent on education in New Zealand now if we had reorganization.

489. It follows, then, that some of the districts get more than their fair share?—I would not like to say that. I think there is money being wasted by the overlapping of districts, as I pointed out in the case of Taranaki and Wanganui.

490. You think it is a question of organization that would improve the condition in such a way that a great deal of money would be saved?—Yes, I think so—the whole system from top to bottom, primary, secondary, and university.

491. You are aware that a colonial scale of staffing has to be made on a basis of a net capitation of £3 8s. 9d.?—I believe that is the present condition, but there is no reason why that should continue.

492. Then, with regard to the 11s. 3d. that is to be expended by the Education Boards on administration and allowances to School Committees, do you not think that the central department could administer that fund just as well as Education Boards?—Quite.

493. If they could administer it quite as efficiently, and they could administer the £3 8s. 9d., t follows, in your opinion, that Education Boards are useless?—I think they would be under the proposed alteration.

494. Then, would you increase the powers of the School Committees under such circumstances?—Yes; I think that is the direction in which we would have to go.

495. From your experience, do you think that School Committees could select teachers adapted for their special needs with equal judgment to that manifested by the Boards in the past?—I think so. If the Committee's powers were enlarged you would get better men on the Committee.

496. And you think that the extinction of Education Boards is desirable?—I think it is inevitable.

497. Would you suggest that the County Council or Road Boards should have the management of education?—There are so many other questions to be considered. A man might be an excellent man for a County Council and yet not be at all a desirable man from an educational point of view. I think that for educational purposes we should have men specially elected to advise the department, and I should not favour the control of education being handed over to Road Boards or County Councils.

498. Would you suggest that special bodies should be elected to control education in each county?—I do not think you should have county boundaries, which in many cases are not at all convenient.

499. You think that the maintenance of schools should be provided by the central Government?—Yes.

500. Has your Board ever considered the bringing-in of pupil-teachers, on the completion of their four years' apprenticeship, to a special school in the town to be trained?—We have considered it, but the difficulty has been the question of funds.

501. On the completion of the engagement of a pupil-teacher, what is generally done?—We adopt a system of what is known as fifth-year pupil-teachers. We debar them from remaining in the school in which they were trained, and we send them away practically as junior assistants in another school for the express purpose of giving them experience.

502. You think that that provides them with training such as your Board is desirous they should obtain?—I do not think it is satisfactory, but it is the best we can do.

503. If the Government gave a grant for the purpose of providing for the special training of pupil-teachers in the district, would your Board favour that in preference to sending the pupil-eachers, after finishing their course, to Wellington or some other district?—Yes.

504. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] I see you pay your Committees of schools above 100 4s. 6d. per pupil; Wanganui pays 3s. 9d.: do your Committees find that sufficient?—No; they are always complaining. We have schemes by which we give them assistance on the pound-for-pound basis up to £12 10s., for shelter-sheds, &c., and we find we have to do that to a considerable extent. The Committees raise very large sums in this district.

505. Do you find the building grant sufficient for your requirements?—It is altogether inadequate. We have had to face the question not only of providing new schools, but that of enlarging old ones.

506. Are you keeping the present schools in proper repair?—Not as we should do. We are making application to the Government for a sum which runs into £15,000 for urgent work.

507. In regard to the district boundaries, it must happen, no matter where the boundaries are, that the duties of adjoining Boards will clash?—Yes; but I think the circumstances here are exceptional. I know the education districts fairly well, and I know of none where the boundaries are so improperly made.

508. *Mr. Weston.*] I suppose you would not complain if, so long as the colony continued the present system of education, the teachers received fair remuneration, irrespective of any capitation allowance?—Quite so.

509. At the same time you think that the expense of education should not be increased?—I think there is enough money spent on education, considering the size of the population.

510. You also think that the present system should be revised?—Yes.

511. In what respect would you revise it—would you reduce the syllabus or reduce the number of schools?—I do not think we can reduce the number of schools very largely. There are a few cases where we could.

512. Then, any revision would have to be in the shape of the syllabus?—I do not know that that would affect the question of cost.

513. If we are not to affect the question of cost by decreasing the number of teachers, how are we to revise the present system with a view to economy?—The question of syllabus is a question of the efficiency of a teacher to overtake the work demanded.

514. What shape would the revision take, then?—I would do away with the present system of high schools, and I would bring the whole education system into line, so that a pupil would go step by step right through to the university, and do away with the multiplicity of control. In Taranaki there are three or four Education Boards whose duties could be undertaken by one body. I refer to the High School Board, Education Board, and School Commissioners.

515. Do you approve of the subjects that are taught in our primary schools, or do you think an improvement could be effected in the selection of other subjects?—I do not think that materially affects the question of salaries.

516. I think you said you did not care whether there was a colonial scale so long as you could get sufficient money for your own requirements?—Not quite that. What I think I implied was, first and foremost, that any scale would be acceptable in Taranaki that would improve the position of affairs locally; but I went on to say that the mere question of salaries to teachers in the primary schools was only one part of a very large question.

517. Supposing, for instance, the Government provided sufficient money to give reasonable remuneration to teachers, would the administration by the Boards as at present meet with your approval?—If the scheme could be so organized that the Boards could work efficiently, I presume there would be no alteration; but it appears to me that in carrying out a colonial scheme the powers of Boards would be cut down to such an extent that they would be too expensive a luxury to retain.

518. That weighs with you against the formation of a colonial scale?—Not at all; I think that should give place to a colonial scale.

519. Have I interpreted your views aright when I say that with you this is a question of money?—Not at all; I emphatically deny that. Instead of increasing the expenditure, the whole system of education throughout the colony should be reorganized, when, I think, the present funds would be sufficient.

520. To bring that about what reforms would you suggest?—I take it that is a matter for the Commission to deal with; but I will give you one instance. I would do away with the various Boards in this district, and accordingly reduce the cost of education.

521. Do you mean that under any circumstances the colony must strive to prevent the increase in the amount voted for education?—No.

522. Do you object to an increase in the education vote?—I do not object if it is found to be necessary after the whole system has been overhauled.

523. You talk about handing over the teaching staff to the Education Department in Wellington: do you ever have any cases of urgency in the matter of supplying teachers?—Yes; occasionally in cases of illness, and so on.

524. Do you not think that these emergency cases could be dealt with more speedily than by the central department?—No; the department would have the telegraph and railways. We sometimes have to close a school for want of a teacher.

525. Do you think the local Committee should have any control over the teacher?—The Committee should have the power of making recommendations to the department.

526. Is not the irregular attendance of some schools attributable to a large extent to the butter industry?—Not altogether.

527. To what else, then?—To bad roads.

528. The butter industry has something to do with it?—I would not say that. If it were not for the butter industry we could not keep some of our schools open, because the children are now enabled to come to school in the milk-carts.

529. Indirectly, if not directly, the butter industry is the cause of the irregular attendance?—No; I do not agree with that. But for the butter industry the children would not be there.

530. But for the butter industry there would not be bad roads?—It might affect the roads to some extent.

531. Can anything be done, in your opinion, to secure for the children in this district the benefit of our schools?—I do not know what could be done.

532. Do not these children have to milk cows before coming to school?—Yes.

533. Do they not arrive considerably after the opening of the school?—Yes.

534. Do they get to the school in all cases with minds properly attuned to receive instruction?—They are very much handicapped from that standpoint. But remember that, were it not for the fact that the school is there, they would get no education at all.

535. Have you studied the reports from the other education districts?—Yes; I generally read them.

536. Have you seen anything in those reports to suggest that the entire education system would be better controlled and administered by the General Government than under the Board?—Yes.

537. What have you seen?—I think it would tend to more general efficiency, and in many ways would be an improvement on the present system.

538. Do you think that pupil-teachers are fairly well educated in this district?—I think their education compares very favourably with that given in other districts.

539. *The Chairman.*] Assuming that the Education Boards and School Committees are all swept away, you do not propose to dispense with councils of advice?—No; I think it is desirable to have some body.

540. How would you suggest that that body should be elected—on a broad or on a restricted franchise?—I would be in favour of making the franchise as broad as possible.

541. Would you build up the small salaries by reducing the larger ones in any part of the colony?—I do not think there is much room for reduction.

542. Do you think the larger salaries ought to be increased?—In some cases.

543. In every case?—No; in some cases I think they are fairly well paid.

544. What is your opinion: do you think teachers would be happier under the Board or under the central department?—I am not a teacher myself, but if I were I would prefer to be under the central department.

545. Do you think that the teachers would have their position improved, or that their chances of promotion would be materially improved, if instead of being under the Education Board they were placed under an elective body such as you suggest, elected by the whole of the people in the same way as members of the House of Representatives are elected?—I think so.

546. Do you not think that the changes in public opinion would affect them?—No.

547. Would not the better-paid class of teachers have something to fear if that were brought about?—No.

H. Dempsey, representing the Taranaki Educational Institute, and Headmaster of the New Plymouth Central School, examined.

548. *Mr. Weston.*] You hail from Canterbury, I think?—Yes.

549. What is the size of your school?—Between 480 and 500.

550. Are your pupil-teachers doing more work than you think they should do?—Yes, I think they are.

551. Would you advocate half a day for tuition and half a day for instruction and study?—Something of that kind.

552. Do you think that the pupil-teachers here, in the matter of education, receive similar advantages to pupil-teachers residing in Otago and Canterbury?—Of course, they do not, not having a training-college.

553. Then, it simply comes to this: that by-and-by they will labour under the disadvantage of having their applications for work laid side by side with applications coming from the larger centres?—Yes.

554. Although treating the matter as a colonial one, pupil-teachers here, then, can scarcely expect to receive the positions that more qualified pupil-teachers would aspire to?—Quite so.

555. Do you think that the pupil-teachers in your district, in the matter of scholarships, have the same advantages as they have in the larger centres?—I think so.

556. Are the children in your country schools allowed a year in age?—No.

557. Do you think they should be allowed that year?—I do not know. I find sometimes that country children take scholarships quite as easily as town children.

558. What are your views on the question of a colonial scale?—There has been no difference of opinion in Taranaki since I came here. All teachers are in favour of a colonial scale, as also are the public and business-men.

559. Would you give me, very briefly, your reasons for favouring a colonial scale of staffing and salaries?—We cannot expect to get the best class of teachers here, and there is always the feeling that they are doing as good work as teachers in similar positions in other districts, and receiving less salary. That causes dissatisfaction.

560. Do you think, on public grounds, apart altogether from the teachers' interests in the matter, that it will be for the good of the colony?—Yes. It is the children that really suffer if we do not get a good class of teachers.

561. But if the Boards were supplied with the requisite money to deal fairly with the teachers, why not leave them with their own scales?—Because I think it is better for the teachers to have the scale uniform all over the colony. I do not think, if left to themselves, that the Boards would adopt the same scale all over the colony.

562. There are times when the circumstances of a place might require elasticity in the matter of appointments?—No, I do not think so.

563. What is your opinion, and the opinion of teachers generally, upon the question of being under the Education Department rather than under the Board?—I do not know that there is any feeling that they should not be under the Board.

564. What is your own feeling?—Personally, I would prefer to be under the Board.

565. Do you see any disadvantage from being under the department?—There might be political influence; then, of course, there are local circumstances, and, of course, the Board know best the positions a teacher is most suited for.

566. Is there any difficulty here about relieving-teachers?—Yes; we have none. There ought to be relieving-teachers in every district.

567. Are there always enough teachers out of employment to fill up casual vacancies?—Not to fill them satisfactorily.

568. Do you think that the teachers trained in Taranaki will be more or less inferior to the teachers in other districts?—They ought to be inferior, because as pupil-teachers they are not receiving the same training as in the larger districts.

569. What suggestion can you make with a view to securing a complete training for the pupil-teachers in Taranaki?—I cannot suggest any, except having training centres established.

570. Would you advocate special grants from the Government, or would you advocate scholarships? What course would you adopt yourself with the view of giving the boys and girls here advantages equal to those obtainable in other places?—I think I would advocate a grant from the Government for special training.

571. Do you think the size of this district would warrant such an expenditure on the part of the Government?—Yes.

572. Seeing that a colonial scale could not be fully brought into operation under four years, have you considered the possibility of the circumstances of the colony and the attitude of Parliament changing during that period?—Yes; it has been considered, and we are prepared to take the risk.

573. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Could you tell at what point teachers in country schools should be paid the same salary as first assistant teachers in town schools?—I have not considered that matter, and could not give an opinion straight off. I should say, however, at an average attendance of 175, or thereabouts.

574. What do you think should be the minimum salary?—£100 for males and £80 for females.

575. Do you think that a central Board would have the same knowledge regarding the requirements of education districts that Education Boards possess?—No, I do not think it is possible that they could have the same knowledge.

576. You would not reduce the powers of Education Boards?—No, I would not.

577. Do you think that the contemplated increases would enable teachers to give something towards a superannuation fund?—Yes; I think it might enable them to give something towards it.

578. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you think that a fully equipped training-college should be established in Taranaki?—No; something similar to what is established in Napier.

579. Do you approve of fully equipped training-colleges being established in the four principal centres, the pupil-teachers being awarded scholarships to provide for their remaining in one of these colleges? Would that not meet with the requirements of any district in the colony?—Yes; my previous answer did not contemplate the establishment of these colleges in the four centres.

580. Do you know that in Victoria a pupil-teacher in the remotest portion of the colony may win a scholarship, and, immediately after completing his course, be transferred to a central college to receive training as a teacher?—I was not aware of that.

581. In addition to the training in the college, would you favour the granting of scholarships to the students of the training-college?—Yes, certainly.

582. Do you think the allotment to pupil-teachers of scholarships granting them attendance at the training-college would be better than establishing a training-school such as you suggest in this district?—Yes.

583. Do you favour the diminution of the number of pupil-teachers as far as possible, and their places being taken by assistants?—Yes, to a certain extent.

584. Have you considered how your school would be affected by the scale?—Under the original scale the main school would suffer so far as the assistants were concerned.

585. What is the staffing of your school now?—An infant mistress, first assistant master, second assistant master, first assistant mistress, second assistant mistress, and six pupil-teachers—five adult teachers besides the head-teacher.

586. Do you believe in the alternation of the sexes?—Not in every case. In my own school the first and second assistants should be males.

587. If the scheme were made so elastic as to leave the Boards the right to say whether or not the second assistant should be a male or female, do you think that would be an improvement?—Yes.

588. You think, at any rate, that in a school above a certain average of attendance the first assistant should be a male teacher?—Certainly.

589. In your opinion, do you think that a woman can successfully manage the Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth Standard classes, having an attendance of 60?—The average woman cannot; physically she is incapable of overtaking the work of those classes.

590. *Mr. Stewart.*] Speaking for the teachers of the Taranaki District, you say they are very dissatisfied with the present state of affairs?—Yes.

591. Do you consider that a colonial scheme of payment is the only way of rectifying those matters of which they complain?—Yes.

592. They are strongly in favour of it?—Yes.

593. Do you think that the differnce in the cost of living is such as to require to be taken into account in the making of a colonial scale?—I do not.

594. Do you think it practicable to take it into account?—I think it would be unwise to do so.

595. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the scale of salaries paid in a school in Otago with that paid in a school of the same average attendance under the Taranaki Board?—Yes; the comparison is altogether in favour of Otago.

596. With regard to the loss of £10 incurred by the country teacher to give an allowance to the sewing-mistress, do you think a teacher should lose this £10?—I think a male teacher should not be in charge of a school of that size.

597. Is the sewing-mistress any assistance to the teacher?—None whatever; his work is the same altogether outside the sewing.

598. Do you favour the centralisation in Wellington of the Inspectors?—I think I do.

599. Do you favour a scheme of superannuation?—Yes.

600. *Mr. Hill.*] I suppose you feel yourself competent to take, if necessary, a school of much larger size than the one you have?—Yes.

601. Are you aware that in England there is only one class of certificate?—No.

602. Do you think, if there was only one class of certificate in, say, two or three grades, it would be quite sufficient under our present regulations?—That is not a matter I have thought about at all.

603. Is it necessary for primary schools to have graduates as their teachers?—Certainly not. I have had graduates who have been the greatest of failures.

604. *Mr. Hogben.*] You understand, with regard to the certificates, that the very fact that it is proposed to make a deduction from those who hold lower certificates shows that the holders of such lower certificates are not debarred?—Yes.

605. You understand that the limitation of the bringing into operation of the scheme is to enable the Boards to bring their staffing more or less into line with the staffing of the scale?—I understand that.

606. Would you be in favour of allowing the replacing of two pupil-teachers by one assistant where the circumstances of the school seem to require it?—Yes.

607. Or by replacing one junior and one pupil teacher by some stronger assistant?—Yes.

608. Do you think that a certain amount of elasticity in that direction would be sufficient to meet the varying requirements of the staffing of the schools of the colony?—Yes, I believe it would.

WANGANUI.

MONDAY, 10TH JUNE, 1901.

Mr. G. S. BRIDGE, Chairman of the Wanganui Education Board, examined.

Mr. Bridge: I may say I object to a colonial scale of staffs and salaries altogether. I do not think it is at all advisable to have the system of education centralised. In a country like ours we should retain local self-government as far as possible, and I am afraid that should education be put entirely into the hands of a central department we should find very often that political influence would interfere with appointments and the government of the schools. Then, if we had a colonial scheme of staffing we should have to be continually referring to the central department for alterations in the staffing that might be required to meet the circumstances of different schools. There are some schools that might be run perhaps with a much larger staff of assistants than is laid down by the scale, and fewer pupil-teachers, whilst other schools might require more pupil-teachers and fewer assistants. I think that Boards, in consultation with their Inspectors and Committees, would be far better judges of the circumstances of individual schools than any central department could possibly be. The Government, by basing on a capitation of £4 per head the scale of salaries to be framed by the Commission, has admitted at the outset that the capitation grant of £3 15s. has not been sufficient, and I may say that had a sufficient capitation grant been given there would never have been the present outcry for a colonial scale of staffs and salaries. The Boards have not had sufficient money to properly carry on their work. A few years ago a conference met in Wellington, and recommended that an extra 5s. should be given, but that recommendation was never given effect to. To give £4 capitation is not the right way of meeting the difficulty. I think a sliding-scale would meet the difficulty far better. Take the large districts, such as Otago and North Canterbury: They are districts that have a number of large schools, and all of us who know anything about the working of the Education Act are aware that the large schools have to keep the small schools, and wherever a district has very few large schools the small schools have to suffer. In Otago and North Canterbury it is possible that £4 capitation per head would be sufficient; but in districts such as Marlborough and Taranaki, where there is not any considerable number of large schools, £4 per head would not satisfy the requirements. In place of that fixed sum, there should be a sliding-scale ranging, I think, from, say, £3 15s. per head for the larger districts up to £5 per head for the districts with few large schools. I think that would enable sufficient salaries to be paid to teachers, and at the same time give a sufficiency of staffing. I should like to bring before the Commission the necessity of giving to the Boards power to exchange teachers. Under the present Act a Board cannot move a teacher in any way without first consulting the Committee, and that consultation has to be a *bonâ fide* one. Several cases have occurred in our district where teachers have been unsatisfactory. We know they can do good work if they like, but for some reason they fail to produce good results. It would be of advantage to the schools if we had it in our power to say to such teachers, "As your work is not satisfactory, we shall move you to a school with a smaller salary. It depends on your own efforts whether in the future you get a larger school or are not retained in the service." We are, however, obliged to consult the Committees, and unless we can find that the teacher is so bad that we can dismiss him, and uphold our dismissal if it comes before the Teachers' Appeal Court, we have to keep the teacher on to the detriment of the school. I think we ought to have power without consultation with the Committee to remove teachers. We have had several instances where it ought to have been done, but the Committees have stood in the way. Then, we are not getting enough for building purposes. In this district a large increase of settlement is going on, and the Government supplies us with money to build schools, but will not give us money for residences. I have brought the matter before the Government time after time, and urged the necessity for a grant for the provision of residences; but when our application for the building grant is received our residences are struck out, and we merely get money for the erection of schools. I think that the residence is as necessary as the school, for the teacher must have a place in which to live. I approve of the proposal of the Inspector-General that the first aid that shall be given to a school shall be an assistant mistress. I think it is a great mistake when the first aid given to a school is a pupil-

teacher. By giving the assistance of a teacher a little more advanced than a fourth-year pupil-teacher, at, say, £80 a year, you are giving some substantial help to the teacher of the school. I think pupil-teachers should be trained, as far as possible, in the large schools when there is no training-school available. It would be a very good idea in some of these large schools if there were classes formed to represent a small country school. This would be good training for the pupil-teachers, and more truly fit them to take charge of a country school when out of their apprenticeship. In one of the schools in Wanganui this has been done on the suggestion of the head-teacher. I notice in the Inspector-General's proposal that a certain class of certificate is required for a school of a certain size, and that should the teacher not hold that certificate a deduction is made from his salary, but that if the teacher holds a higher certificate than that required no addition is made to his salary. I fail to see any fairness in that. If the teacher is competent to do the work, why should any reduction be made? Personally, I think that the Wanganui Board's system of payment is the better one. We pay a salary for the school, and we give a bonus for the certificate, which is an inducement to teachers to raise their certificate. I observe, too, that the Inspector-General recommends that the same salary be given for male and female pupil-teachers. I think the male pupil-teacher should get the higher salary. We want to induce young men to enter the profession, and we must give them a proportionately higher salary. Again, we have very often to send male pupil-teachers out to schools to which we could not send a female teacher. On this account, although, perhaps, nominally they do the same work, still there ought to be a higher salary given to boys than to girls. The recommendation of Mr. Hogben for assistants is not a good one. I think the assistants' salaries are much too low.

Mr. Weston: Are you speaking of the original scale or the amended scale?

Mr. Bridge: It is an alternative scale, not an amended scale. The alternative scale is very little different. We have two very clear instances in our district. In Marton, with an average attendance of 205, we have a first assistant master. I understand by the proposed scale that the first assistant shall be a mistress; therefore the present first assistant at Marton will be the second assistant, and his salary will be reduced from £160 to £95; and even if he were first assistant his salary under the original proposal would be £118 16s. Another instance I will give you is the case of the Terrace End School, where the attendance is 206. The first assistant there is a male, and at present he receives £165 a year. As first assistant under the proposed scheme his salary would be £120, and as second assistant he would get £90. I can give several other instances. Take the case of the Wanganui Boys' School: The first assistant there now has £190; under the Inspector-General's proposal he would have £168. I may explain how I have arrived at these figures. I have not taken the salary of the assistant master at the rate set down in the proposed colonial scale of staffs and salaries, but I have taken into consideration the certificates that these masters hold, and then adapted their salary to the requirements of the scale. The first assistant at the Wanganui Boys' School holds an E1 certificate, whereas by the proposed scale a D2 is required, and consequently a deduction of £1 per cent. is made. The second assistant is better off; he holds a D1 certificate, and we give him £160. The Inspector-General's scheme gives him £170. I should like to point out another anomaly that is manifest in the scale originally proposed. The Commission will remember that a deduction of 20 per cent. is to be made in the case of teachers holding no certificate. A teacher up to 14, whether certificated or not, receives £5 per head. From 15 to 17 that teacher will get less salary than if the attendance were only 14. That must have been an oversight in preparing this proposed scale. There is another proposal that seems rather unreasonable. Why should a man in a school of from 19 to 35 have £10 taken off his salary to pay for a sewing-mistress? If you deduct from one class of teachers for the purpose of paying the sewing-mistress, why not do so all along the line for the same purpose? Then, there does not seem to be any reason why the certificate for the infant mistress should be one division higher than for the assistant mistress. If the proposal was to give the infant mistress a higher salary I could understand the reason for the higher certificate, but the salary of these teachers is the same. I think that the proposed scale for the payment of teachers in the small schools is a fair one. Boards in the past have not been in a position to pay the teachers of small schools as large salaries as they should have been paid. I think the salaries ought to be fair living salaries, and I have no doubt that if the Boards had had the means at their hand they would have raised them. I do not think, however, that there is any reason for raising the salaries of the larger schools to the extent proposed. It seems to me that they have been raised to the disadvantage of the assistant teachers. It is proposed to raise the salaries of teachers of large schools above those at present in existence in Wanganui, which I think are very fair ones. We give a salary, and also a bonus. In comparing these salaries, I have had difficulty with regard to the second, third, and fourth assistants, because I do not know what certificate is to be required; but we always give a certificate bonus, and our salary in some cases, without the certificate bonus at all, is above that proposed to be given by the Inspector-General. I think that the certificates required are in some cases too high. The Inspector-General suggests that an E2 is necessary for a school of from 19 to 35. The certificate depends on length of service, and therefore an E2 must have had a long experience of teaching, and it is rather unreasonable to place such an experienced teacher in charge of such a small school. I think if an E4 had been suggested it would have been quite sufficient. I understand, of course, that an E4 might be appointed, but in that case £4 per cent. for each division would be deducted from the salary. D2 is required for the next grade, and I think D3 is sufficient. I do not think that D1 should be required as early as 75 to 100. It might go on to 225 or 250 before a D1 was demanded, and then on to 420 before a C1 was asked for. There is no allowance made for instructing pupil-teachers. It may be said that that is the duty of the head-teacher; but we give these teachers a salary for doing the teaching of the school, and for work connected with the school, not for teaching pupil-teachers, certainly. It

might happen that there are two head-teachers occupying schools of the same size. One man might have two or three pupil-teachers to instruct, and the other might have none; consequently one teacher would do considerably more work for the same money than the other. I think that where a master or a mistress has to instruct pupil-teachers it is only right that he or she should be paid for so doing. The Inspector-General recommends £5 a year more for the salary of pupil-teachers than our Board allows. Our salary is not satisfactory to the Board, but we had to fix it in accordance with our finance. We revised our scale the other day and sent it down for the approval of the Government. The salaries of our male pupil-teachers were made higher than those of the females, and it was objected to. We had to bring the boys down to the level of the female teachers, as we had not enough money to raise the females up to the level of the boys. Instead of raising the salaries of pupil-teachers, the lodging-allowance should be increased. In living at home a pupil-teacher is a long way better off with £20 a year than with £30 a year away from home. If that £5 was taken from the salary and added to lodging-allowance, and instead of making it, for the respective years, £10, £10, £5, and £5, it was made £17, £14, £11, and £8—as the salary rises decreasing the lodging-allowance—it would, in my opinion, be a better arrangement. Now, dealing with the capitation grant, it is proposed to give the Boards for administrative purposes 11s. 3d. That is altogether inadequate. It cost us very nearly 10s. 8d. per head last year for our departmental expenses, and in that sum there is no allowance for what we have to pay for relieving-teachers. It merely includes office salaries, departmental, inspection, truancy, school funds, training of teachers, examination of pupil-teachers, &c. 11s. 3d. will only give us 7d. more than that, and is not sufficient to enable us to give more to our School Committees. I think that the Board requires, instead of 11s 3d., about 14s. or 15s. I think that some different arrangement might be made about teachers' certificates. I think the present system of raising certificates by length of service is very misleading, for the reason that you are unable to get rid of unsatisfactory teachers. If a teacher is not bad enough to warrant notice of dismissal he has to be kept on, and simply from length of service rises in grades of certificate. Any one not knowing anything of the past of that teacher would think that he was competent, whereas he might be a very incompetent teacher. The division should be raised more for ability to teach than for length of service. I think also that power should be given to the department, on the recommendation of the Inspector, to reduce a man's certificate if he is not doing the quality of work that he has been doing in the past.

1. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] In Palmerston North you have three schools; would it not have been possible to have had one school, or not more than two schools, to do the work of the three?—I do not know. My own opinion is that Terrace and Central Schools would have been sufficient.

2. Do you think it necessary to have three schools in Wanganui?—Under present circumstances it is. You must remember that these schools have been in Wanganui ever since the Education Act has been in force, and if we were to put all those schools together, and make one central school of them, we would have to build an entirely new set of school-buildings.

3. What is your opinion in regard to separate schools for boys and girls?—I believe in mixed schools. In them boys get civilised by association with the girls, and the girls lose a large amount of that namby-pambyism that they acquire when associating only with their own sex.

4. Have you any half-time schools?—Only two.

5. You have not thought of the principle of conveying children to schools and so doing away with some of the small schools?—In place of establishing a school in a district in the Manawatu, we tried to make arrangements with a coach to convey the children to a school already established, but we could not make the necessary arrangements.

6. The settlers themselves would not take it up?—No; they wanted the school there. As far as possible, we never establish a school within four miles of another school.

7. Do you not think that the lack of prospect of promotion has been a reasonable grievance on the part of teachers?—I think one grievance has been that most of the Boards seem to conserve their positions for their own teachers. There is very little interchange of teachers between Boards. I think, possibly, one reason why teachers want a colonial scale of staffs and salaries is that the profession should be recognised as a whole, and that there should be a more ready interchange of teachers between educational districts.

8. What I referred to was the inability of the Boards to promote teachers?—I think that might have something to do with it.

9. Do you find that when vacancies occur in the larger schools it is very seldom that a country teacher succeeds in obtaining the appointment?—We have so very few vacancies in them—those holding positions there stick to them like limpets.

10. Does the country teacher not get out of the range of the public eye?—I think there is a tendency on the part of Committees to select some one whom they know.

11. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you think we can really claim to have a national system of education when we have thirteen different scales of staffing and payment in the colony?—I do not see that that affects the question. The system of education is the syllabus of education that is given.

12. Do you not think that the staffing of the schools and the salaries of the teachers are as important a part of the system as the syllabus?—Possibly; but, as I said, there would be no difficulty about the salary if the Government would give us the money that is necessary, and the present inquiry is based on 5s. more than we have had in the past.

13. You object to a uniform scale of staffing and a uniform rate of pay to the teachers of the colony?—Yes. I object to the control of the education system by the central department. If the department had the right to interfere they might seriously interfere with the work of the Boards.

14. Suppose sufficient elasticity is allowed; that the Boards are allowed to place either a male or a female teacher in a position; that they retain complete freedom in the placing of the sexes on

their staffs; and that they are allowed the privilege of putting on two pupil-teachers instead of an assistant, or *vice versâ:* would that meet the difficulty?—Yes, as far as the staffing is concerned. But, if there is to be a colonial scale of payment adopted, then the Boards would have nothing to do with financing that, and the whole control of payment would be taken out of their hands. The Board would simply be the medium through which salaries are paid.

15. The disadvantage that has existed amongst teachers throughout the colony has been caused, I think, mainly through inequality of salaries paid in various education districts?—That may be more apparent than real. £200 a year here may go further than £200 in Auckland or Dunedin.

16. Do you find the right class of boys is entering the service in sufficient numbers in Wanganui?—We are not getting a sufficient number of them; the inducements—salary and future prospects—are not sufficient.

17. Do you not think, then, that there would be less dissatisfaction and more chances of promotion and transfer from district to district if we had a uniform scale of salary, as is the case in the Railway and Postal Departments?—I do not know. From what I have heard of the Railway Department the scheme is not pronounced a success. Incidentally, I have heard that the railway classification is not any more successful than our present teachers' system.

18. Do you think that where pupil-teachers are necessary in the smaller schools they should not be raw pupil-teachers, but in their second or third year, and transferred from a larger school?—Yes.

19. Do you know that the bonus system was tried in Otago and found a failure?—Possibly. It has not been a failure in Wanganui.

20. Do you not think that we have a sufficient supply of certificated teachers without employing uncertificated teachers for schools under 14?—I think we have; but still we have to provide for all contingencies.

21. If you could afford to give such salaries as are suggested in the scale—from £80 in schools of 15 up to £120 for schools of 20—would you have the same difficulty in getting ex-pupil-teachers to apply for those schools?—No, I do not think so.

22. Could you state how much the training of teachers costs you?—£200. I can give you the figures for our incidental expenses, if you like.

23. What does house allowance come to?—£564 9s. 7d.

24. Rent?—£30 approximately.

25. What was your total expense for incidentals?—£4,745 17s. 6d.

26. If the training of teachers were provided for, as a number of Education Boards think it should be, by the central department, that would relieve you of an expenditure of £200?—Yes.

27. Then, again, if house allowance was provided for by the Building Fund, that would relieve you of £594 in rent and house allowance?—Yes.

28. So that that would make available a sum of about £800?—Yes.

29. In that case your finance would be considerably relieved?—To a great extent. I should not like to say it would completely relieve them, for the £800 would only mean about another 2s. per head.

30. You have five relieving-teachers in this district: does not that seem rather a large number for such a small district as Wanganui?—Sometimes we have more. At the present time we have five relieving-teachers and two temporarily appointed.

31. What provision have you in the way of salaries for sick-leave?—Under the regulations teachers are not entitled to any salary for sick-leave. All applications come up at the Board's meeting, and we make an allowance not exceeding one month in the year.

32. Did you deduct from the £445 received by relieving-teachers the amount you do not pay to teachers absent on sick-leave?—I could not tell what that amounted to. The salary of the relieving-teacher is charged to the school in which he or she is relieving. It would not be an impossibility, but it would be a great labour, to prepare a full statement. There cannot be much saving, because our teachers are not absent more than one month in the year as a rule.

33. You suggested that teachers' certificates might be reduced: do you not think that would be placing too much power in the hands of Inspectors?—I do not think so. If an Inspector can be trusted to recommend the raising of a teacher he should be trusted to recommend the reduction.

34. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you not think that the anomalies that now exist would still be likely to obtain with a differentiated capitation?—Of course; because you have got thirteen Boards, which would have their own ideas of staffing and salaries, and it is not likely that they would all have the same.

35. Do you think Boards are competent bodies to say what should or should not be the staffing of the schools?—I should think so, after consulting with their Inspectors. I do not see why either the central department, or even a Royal Commission, should be better able to state what the staff should be than the Inspectors.

36. But we have the advantage of receiving evidence throughout the colony—evidence of men viewing the matter from varying standpoints: does not that give the Commission an advantage?—Yes; but it does not follow that their report will be a correct one any more than the individual opinion of a member of a Board.

37. It is more likely to be a correct one?—I do not like to say so. I would like to point out that a certain amount of previous experience is required in order to judge the value of testimony.

38. Have you calculated the total amount that your Board will receive in salary and incidental expenses under the proposed scale?—No.

39. You are aware that the second scheme is more liberal than the first?—In some respects it is. It is more liberal to some of the higher schools, to which they have applied money which it

appears to me should have been devoted to the lower staffs. I do not say that the salaries proposed to be given to these teachers are too high, but high salaries are given to the head-teachers at the expense of the assistant teachers. I understand from Mr. Hogben, however, that that is not so.

40. How many of your schools have an average of over 330?—Five.

41. Then, all but five schools would come under the alternative scheme which is in evidence?—Yes.

42. You said the cost of living might vary very considerably: does the cost of living vary in your own district?—Yes; I think a man in Palmerston, say, would be able to live more cheaply than a man in Eltham.

43. Does your board differentiate the salaries so as to meet the question of the cost of living?—No.

44. Yet you suggest to the Commission that they should differentiate their scale?—No; I did not say anything of the kind. I was speaking more particularly of the different localities of a district. I said that the cost of living in Auckland might be different from what it is in Wanganui, Dunedin, or any other part of the colony.

45. Is there any evidence that it costs more to live in one part of your district than in another?—I do not think I said it cost more to live in Wanganui. It is a well-known fact that in a town like Auckland provisions, and clothing especially, can be bought more cheaply than in a town like Wanganui or Palmerston. At least, that is my opinion.

46. You are quite clear upon the advisability of charging house allowance against the Building Fund?—Yes.

47. You said that, in your opinion, there would have been no reason for this demand for a colonial scale if the Board had been sufficiently provided with money by the department?—Yes.

48. Do you think that there is the stability about the scale drawn up by a Board that there would be with one drawn up by Act of Parliament?—I think so. Our scale has been in force for a large number of years.

49. At what notice could the Board vary it?—The regulation could be altered by giving a month's notice, and the alteration of salaries would come into effect at the expiration of three months after notice had been given to the teachers.

50. Do you not think that want of stability is also a cause of dissatisfaction amongst teachers?—No.

51. What would approximately be the maximum length of your district?—Two hundred and fifty or three hundred miles.

52. *Mr. Luke.*] You say you are not in favour of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries: do you not think that it would be advisable to have some means by which a teacher might be transferred, either at his own wish or in the interests of education, from, say, Dunedin or North Canterbury to Auckland or Wanganui?—I do not know. A teacher removing from one district to another has to consider how much he will have to pay for house-rent and cost of living, and the same salary in one place might not mean the same as the same salary in another place.

53. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long have you been Chairman of this Board?—Three years, I think.

54. You say there has been very little alteration of the scale of staffs and salaries in the Wanganui district?—Very little.

55. You made a reduction, did you not, the year before last?—In October, 1899. That was the second alteration.

56. Was the other reduction in 1893?—I cannot remember the date. I was a member of the committee of the Board appointed to revise the scale of salaries.

57. The alterations so far have gone in the direction of decreasing instead of increasing the salaries of teachers?—The last one did.

58. Did not the first one also?—I do not think it did.

59. Do you consider the scale you have drawn up a good one?—Yes, considering the amount of money we had at our disposal.

60. Your scale does not agree with any one of the other twelve scales in the colony?—It does not follow from that that ours is not as good as any in the colony.

61. If the Wanganui Board were relieved of this function of drawing up the scale of staffs and salaries, would its power and influence grow any the less?—I think it would.

62. Do you consider that political influence is as bad as local influence?—I stated that I thought the appointment of teachers should not be in the hands of Committees at all, but in the hands of the Boards, the members of which are free from local influence.

63. Do you not consider that there are too many aided schools in the Wanganui District?—No. I think when settlers go out into the back country, out of the reach of schools, it would be cruelty to keep their children for years without education simply because it was impossible to get 20 or 25 children together to constitute a full school.

64. Do you not think that if Parliament laid it down that schools were not to be established except with a certain number of pupils that it would take off a certain amount of the pressure that is now brought to bear to establish these aided schools?—I do not know.

65. With regard to incidental expenses, I notice in your balance-sheet of the year before last a considerable item is "Expenses of Education Board members": is that for attending meetings?—Attending meetings and going on special committees of inquiry.

66. Could the Inspectors not perform that latter function?—No; the Board consider that the proper people to hold inquiries as to the validity of School Committees' elections, &c., are members of the Board.

67. Do you consider that the Inspectors should be placed under the central department, so as to secure uniformity of inspection?—No.

68. Would not it save your Board about £700 a year if such were the case?—It might save that, but the Government would have to pay it. It would save our Board a good deal more than £700.

69. Apart from that point, do you not consider that to secure uniformity of examination throughout the colony it would be advisable if the Inspectors were under the central department?—Uniformity might be obtained by more frequent conferences of Inspectors. The Inspectors' services are required for more than the inspection of schools. Their personal knowledge of the teachers is very valuable. An Inspector may know that a teacher is admirably adapted for one school, and yet not be fitted for another school of the same size.

70. What can you do, seeing that the Committee has the selection?—Quite so; but we might not send on this particular name.

71. Do you consider, then, that the powers of the Board and the Committee should be defined by the Legislature?—I think that the power of removal of teachers should be placed solely in the hands of the Board.

72. What do you mean when you refer to payment of capitation on a sliding scale?—Payment ranging from, say, £3 15s. to £5 per head.

73. Do you advocate that female teachers should get the same salary as males?—No.

74. Do you consider that they should get the same up to a certain limit?—That is a very vague expression. Up to a certain limit I would say "Yes," but a male teacher, I think requires a higher salary than a female. In most cases a male teacher takes up the profession as his life's work; in many cases the female teacher takes it up until she goes out of the profession; but even if she is not married a female teacher has only herself to support, whilst a male teacher has to support a wife and family.

75. Do you consider that the system of paying bonuses on certificate works well in Wanganui?—I think so.

76. Supposing a teacher fell out with the Inspector, and the Inspector, to punish him, recommended a reduction?—We do not employ that kind of Inspector.

77. Are you in favour of a superannuation scheme?—No; I think that everybody ought to be paid a salary which will enable him to save. I do not think teachers should be superannuated any more than a sawmiller.

78. Would you favour the establishment of training-colleges in the four large centres, and the establishment of collegiate classes in the smaller centres, in order to enable teachers to get efficient training?—We are practically doing that now. We have in Wanganui and Palmerston North classes for the training of teachers in the direction of gaining their certificates. As a matter of fact, a great many teachers get their certificates before they are out of their time.

79. Do you think that the salaries of pupil-teachers should be higher?—No; I do not think that the salary proposed is too low, but I think that the lodging-allowance is too low. To my mind £10 does not represent the difference between living at home and living away from home.

[Owing to a sudden family bereavement Mr. Bridge's evidence was not completed.]

Dr. J. Smyth, Inspector of Schools, examined.

Dr. Smyth: I have not been long appointed to my present position, and for a number of years prior to this I was out of New Zealand, consequently there are many questions of detail upon which both teachers and members of the Board are far more competent to speak. Any statement I make will deal more with questions of principle and questions of government. The first matter I would like to speak upon is the question—though it may not lie within your province—that very much concerns the well-being of teachers: I refer to the question of the training of primary-school teachers. As far as I am aware, no money has been set apart for the training of primary-school teachers, and I would urge that a certain sum should be devoted to that purpose. I would even go further, and advocate—though this matter may not be within the scope of the Commission also—the same thing in regard to the teachers in the secondary schools. The system of training of pupil-teachers is not carried out in an efficient manner, such as it should be, and the best means are not adopted. Take any type of school you like—say, from 90 to 120 in attendance, where a first pupil-teacher would be granted: that pupil-teacher will, in all probability, work for three or four years in charge of the Second or Third Standard, and after that is perhaps sent to take charge of a school without having received any training in organization, in managing three or four classes, in drawing up a time-table, or in such other work he may be called upon to perform, and consequently he will be one, two, or three years in learning how to properly handle the school he has been put in charge of. Take, also, a pupil-teacher trained in a very large school: for one or two years that pupil-teacher has to do only a kind of supervision—marking exercise-books, and so on; assisting in reading, writing, and drawing lessons, afterwards managing part of a class or a lower class. He teaches that class for perhaps one or two years, and is then sent out again to take charge of a school. If you want the teacher to be trained to do the work he should have some supplementary means of receiving training. Inspectors, of course, expect teachers to give instruction in the subjects in the syllabus in an efficient manner, and, that being the case, the country should see that teachers are properly trained to do so. With this in view, I am in favour of establishing one or more training-colleges—I do not say how many—where pupil-teachers could be sent to receive the advantages of a university education under men who had a wide outlook or had wider views in regard to the teaching profession than most of the masters have. If it is not possible to send all our pupil-teachers to a training-college, some other means should be provided in the different districts in the way of model schools. There should be a model school in connection with all large schools, and a pupil-teacher be put in charge of that model school during the last six months of his career. Then, when he is sent forth to take charge of a

school, he will know something of organization. As soon as a pupil-teacher is sent from the training-college it is a good thing to put him on probation for a year or two, and the salary should not be the maximum put down for that grade. After one or two years, on the Inspector seeing that the pupil-teacher is competent, his salary should then be raised to the maximum. I think Inspectors should have the power to recommend to the department, as Mr. Bridge advocated this morning, that teachers should be lowered in status as well as raised. After all, this is only advocating what is in the interests of all true teachers. The teacher who does his or her work conscientiously should know that his services will be rewarded, and, again, in the case of the teacher who has not been doing satisfactory work for perhaps some years, I think it is in the interests of education that such a teacher should be made to feel it. Regarding the transference of teachers, it is doubtful what is the interpretation of the Act on that matter, but, so far as I understand it, the Boards have not the power at the present time to transfer. It seems to me, judging from the experience I have had, that it would be a very good thing if the Boards, so long as they remain, had the power to transfer, always, of course, acting on the advice of the Inspectors. There are times when a good teacher may happen to go into a district and for some reason or another that teacher may not suit; he may fall out with the Committee, or there may be other reasons, and as a consequence that teacher does not do as good work as he has been in the habit of doing. There is no doubt that it would be in the very best interests of that teacher, and, indeed, in the interests of all concerned, if the Board had the power to transfer that teacher, on the recommendation of the Inspector, to another district. Take another type of teacher—take the teacher who has charge of a small country school, and who is doing fairly good work: his school may grow in attendance, an industry may happen to spring up in the district, causing an influx of population, and the attendance of the school goes up as much again. The teacher may not be able to manage that school, though he was able to manage the smaller school. What is the Inspector or the Board to do? The Inspector goes to the school, but the teacher may not be doing such bad work as to enable the Inspector to report that his work is very bad, although he knows he is not the right man in the right place; and though he may have assistants under him doing good work, still he is not doing the work of the higher standards that should be done, and which is in the educational interests of the children attending his school. I am opposed to absolute power being placed in the hands of Inspectors—everything should be done on clear evidence, and, if necessary, there should be the right to the Court of appeal. I am sure it would be in the best interests of education if such power was invested in the hands of Education Boards, just as much as I think it would be if Boards had the power to appoint. With many other points in the suggested scales I am in accord. I favour the alternative scheme more than the first suggested scheme, particularly so far as the salaries of assistants are concerned, and the introduction of an assistant when the average attendance of a school reaches 40, instead of 35, as in the first scale. Probably, had I been asked my opinion in the drawing-up of the scale I should have put it at 45, more particularly seeing that teachers' salaries are raised all along the line. I notice that the question of appointing relieving-teachers has not been considered in either of the scales.

80. *Mr. Davidson.*] You stated that you approved of the suggested alternative scale in so far as it introduced a certificated mistress when the average attendance reaches 40, instead of 35?—Yes, I do.

81. You notice that the suggested salary to be paid to the infant mistress, or certificated female assistant, between the grade of 40 and 65 is £95?—Yes.

82. I think I understood you to mean from your remarks that pupil-teachers who had passed through their apprenticeship successfully, and had been appointed to a school, should receive a somewhat lower salary than the maximum?—That is so.

83. Suppose a female teacher who had successfully passed through her apprenticeship was appointed as mistress in a school with an attendance of between 40 and 50, would you make another grade there, and would you suggest that her salary should be £80 instead of £90?—No; I should recommend putting a teacher on probation for the first two years.

84. What salary would you suggest should be paid?—In the case of a female teacher, £75; in the case of a male teacher, £85.

85. But there would not be a male teacher in that particular position?—Yes, I understand that.

86. You know, as an Inspector, that a school with an average attendance between 40 and 50, and with two certificated teachers, would be a very easy one to manage?—Yes, that is so.

87. What I wish to make clear is, would it not be better to make another grade between 40 and 50 carrying a salary of £80 instead of £90, as it is in the scale?—Such a proposal was not in my thoughts when I spoke. You could appoint mistresses to small schools between 40 or 50 in attendance, and they might remain there for a period of years. As I said before, let their salaries be below the maximum for the first two years, and then bring them up to the maximum.

88. You mean that, in the event of the Inspector's reports being satisfactory, their salaries should be increased to the maximum?—Yes, that is my idea.

89. What is your opinion as to the requirement of minimum certificates for the various grades of schools—in fact, the requirements at all: do you think that the principle is a good one, or do you think that the positions should be thrown open, no particular certificates being demanded in any grade of school?—No; I would be rather in favour of laying down that a certain certificate should be required for a certain school, as in the scale, always leaving it open, of course, that a teacher who does not possess the required certificate may yet receive the appointment if deemed satisfactory in other respects.

90. *Mr. Stewart.*] Are you in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—I am.

91. You think it is in the best interests of all?—Yes.

92. I believe you have lived in more than one education district?—Yes.

93. Do you think that the circumstances prevailing in different education districts are such as to involve different scales of staffs?—I should say, No.

94. Do you think it would be a satisfactory solution of the difficulty if, instead of a colonial scale of salaries, we had a varying scale of capitation?—That is a question I have not gone sufficiently into, and I do not know whether it would be a satisfactory solution of the difficulty.

95. I understand you believe Inspectors should have the power to reduce teachers' certificates: might that not mean that one Inspector would perhaps hold an entirely different view from another Inspector as to when reductions on certificates should be made?—I might answer that question by asking if Inspectors are all of the same opinion on the question of raising teachers' certificates.

96. Do you not think there should be a consultation between two Inspectors at least, in regard to such matters?—As a matter of fact, most of the Education Boards in the colony have two Inspectors, and, of course, there is always a consultation between them. The department may not act on the recommendations of the Inspectors.

97. The department must act on the recommendations of the Inspector to raise certificates?—Yes; but certain limitations could be laid down before disrating.

98. You think there should be limitations?—Yes.

99. You think there should be limitations in regard to disrating?—Probably so.

100. Do you think it is possible for us to consider the matter of a colonial scale of staff or a colonial scale of salaries without considering the question of there being a residence attached to schools?—I think the question of a residence should be taken into consideration.

101. You have seen the scale, of course, and have noticed the provision for making it a charge against the building fund: do you approve of that?—Yes.

102. Do you think that the duty of instructing pupil-teachers should be in the hands of head-teachers, who should be paid a sufficient salary for the instruction given, or that they, the head-teachers, should be paid by the results of pupil-teachers' examinations?—I do not think it so much matters if you pay a head-teacher a sufficiently large salary.

103. We have heard a good deal about the variation in the cost of living in the different provincial districts: what is your opinion in regard to the matter?—The difference has never been so very great in my own particular case. I may point out, however, that I have always moved upwards, and that my salary was correspondingly increased, so that perhaps I am not in the best position to judge.

104. You think that your increased means may have blinded you to increased cost?—Possibly so; I have not been removed to expensive districts where the cost of living is high.

105. Do you know of those districts?—No; I have heard that Wellington is very expensive to live in.

106. You cannot give your opinions as evidence in that respect?—No.

107. *Mr. Luke.*] I understand your opinion is that the instruction given to pupil-teachers by headmasters is not enough?—Not enough to train them for the work they are afterwards called on to do.

108. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the suggested scale, in regard to salaries, with the scale of salaries paid by the Wanganui Board?—Yes, I have compared the first scale; the second one has been in my hands only a few days.

109. How does the first scale compare with the Wanganui scale?—For schools up to 50 or 60 in attendance the salaries under the suggested scale are better than the salaries under the Wanganui Board's scale; for schools between 60 and 140 in attendance the Wanganui Board pays a better salary.

110. Including the bonus on certificates?—Yes.

111. How does it compare in regard to the staffing?—The staffing is very much the same in one way. The Wanganui Board has no fixed mode of staffing; occasionally the Board gives pupil-teachers and occasionally assistants.

112. Does the Board not adhere rigidly to its scale?—The Board adheres rigidly to it, if you can understand me. It gives a pupil-teacher for 35 pupils, a junior assistant for 45, or an assistant for 60, and it lies with the Board which form the assistance shall take.

113. Do you consider that in any scheme a certain amount of elasticity should be allowed to the Boards to meet exceptional circumstances of that sort?—I do not know; it might be as well. I believe, in most scales there should be a certain amount of room left.

114. Do you consider there should be a differentiation in the standard of work required in a country school in which all standards are represented, and where the teacher is unaided, as compared with a large fully staffed town school?—Yes.

115. With regard to the reduction on certificates, do you find that the system of granting bonuses on certificates works well in this district?—I have not been long enough in the district to have gained experience to answer the question, but from what I gather from the Chairman of the Board I should say it does work well.

116. You are not aware of any other district in which that system is adopted at the present time?—No, I do not know of any other district.

117. With regard to the salaries paid to female teachers, do you consider that they should receive the same remuneration as male teachers provided they do their work as efficiently?—No; I am opposed to equal payments.

118. On what grounds?—It depends on the principle you go upon. The question is whether the State should act on the principle of equal pay for equal work, or, as it is called, equal pay for equal burdens. My contention is that the State should pay on the latter principle.

119. Would you differentiate according to the cost of living in different districts?—I do not think that this is necessary.

120. Do you consider that the difference between the salaries paid to male teachers and female teachers should be minimised as far as possible? In Southland the difference is 10 per cent., and in Wanganui it is 25 per cent.: do you not consider that 25 per cent. is too much of a difference?—I have not gone into the figures sufficiently to answer that question.

121. Do you consider that the salary paid to a teacher should be based on the average attendance for the preceding quarter or on the four preceding quarters?—I should say, on the four quarters; but it remains an open question as to whether salaries should be paid on the average attendance at all.

122. Do you think, then, that salaries should be paid on the highest attendance or a percentage of the roll-number?—I have not gone into that principle; I think it would be fairer to pay on the roll-number.

123. Do you consider that for the operation of the working-average 50 per cent. of the roll number is too low? Should it be three-fifths, three-quarters, or two-thirds?—I have not considered that 50 per cent. is too low.

124. Do you consider there should be uniformity of examination for pupil-teachers throughout the colony?—Yes.

125. Regarding a superannuation scheme: did you say you were in favour of a scheme of superannuation?—I did not say so; but if there is any class of servants in the colony deserving of a pension, then I say the teachers deserve it.

126. Do female teachers preponderate in the Wanganui Education District?—I fancy they do.

127. According to the report of 1899, are you aware that they are in the minority?—Yes.

128. Do you consider that the percentage of pupil-teachers in this district is too high?—Yes. If the proposed scale came into force it would reduce the pupil-teachers here by one-half.

129. With regard to the pupil-teacher system in the Wanganui District, there is not much provision made for the employment of pupil-teachers after they have served their apprenticeship, is there?—They are allowed to remain in the schools.

130. You have no expectation of finding positions for all the pupil-teachers you have in the service at the present time?—So long as we do not appoint any new ones, then, of course, those we have at the present time will fill the vacancies that arise. The ex-pupil-teachers will remain on and fill the vacancies which occur in the teachers' ranks.

131. With regard to the unification of the system, do you believe in granting bursaries, exhibitions, and scholarships, in order that the brighter children of the primary schools, children of the poorer classes, should be encouraged to attend the secondary schools, and afterwards the university?—Yes; I consider that is the duty of the State.

132. You give liberal scholarships under the Wanganui Board?—Yes.

133. Do you find that the pupils avail themselves of those scholarships?—Yes.

134. *Mr. Hill.*] Are you aware what the present system of education is in England?—No.

135. Do you know anything of the classification adopted by the Education Boards in England in regard to teachers?—No.

136. Do you know anything of the method that is adopted in the Australian States?—Victoria is the only one I am at all acquainted with.

137. You are aware that the system of education there is centralised?—Yes.

138. And that in England it is not?—Not in the same sense.

139. You are aware that the Education Department in England recognises that it should supervise the issue of certificates?—Yes.

140. They simply examine the teachers for certificates?—Yes.

141. And, so long as a teacher is certificated, it is open for that teacher to apply for any situation in the country?—Yes.

142. You recognise, then, that our system in New Zealand is not a centralised one in the same sense as it is in Australia?—Yes.

143. The teachers are directly under the Minister of Education?—Yes.

144. And they are paid their salaries by the Education Department without any intervening authority?—Yes.

145. Here in New Zealand there are Boards established, and they have control of the money—that is, the £3 15s. capitation grant is paid by Act to the Boards for special purposes?—Yes.

146. In your opinion, which would be the better system for New Zealand—a centralised system such as is recognised in the Australian States, or the free system such as is adopted in England, where School Boards exist, and where a teacher who is certificated is open to apply for any situation that may be available?—I prefer the open system; I am opposed to the system of centralisation such as exists in Victoria.

147. You think that the system prevailing at present of establishing Education Boards is to be preferred?—Yes.

148. Do you think that, so long as a teacher is certificated, it should be open and competent for that teacher to apply for any situation that may be available?—Yes.

149. Competent for the teacher to apply for any situation available in a certain education district, or would you recognise the right of applying for any situation in the colony?—Yes; the right to apply for any situation in the colony.

150. Do you think the teacher's certificate should carry that right?—Yes.

151. In the matter of classification of teachers, do you think that, all things being equal—that is, in the matter of certificates—it would not be better to leave out the question of certificates altogether where Education Boards have control?—That is practically what I answered before.

152. You are not satisfied with the present system of certification of teachers?—I do not know that I said that.

153. Does it follow that C1 men are better than D1 men?—No, it does not.

154. Does it follow that a D1 man is better than an E1 man as a teacher?—On the whole, I should say it does.

155. In what way?—Well, I should say the man who is not able to take a D certificate must have a defect somewhere.

156. Does it follow that he is a weak teacher?—In the main, I think it does for certain classes of schools.

157. What is the necessity for the grade of certificates being defined for any class of school?—I should say, to encourage teachers to improve their certificates.

158. Will not competition do without such a requirement if the teachers are aware that there are certain things obtainable?—Probably; but I think the aim, or the ideal, should be always laid down.

159. Would you recommend that there should be promotion according to classification—that is, when a man gets a C certificate he should be entitled to be promoted should a vacancy occur? Yes. Of course, it depends in whose hands the power of promotion is; if you gave the power of promotion to Boards, and the man was an efficient teacher, the Board would promote him.

160. Do you not think that such a system of classification would tend to make D1 men suffer?—I do not think so; there might be instances, of course, where a D1 man might suffer.

161. Do you not think that School Committees, having teachers in their schools of lower classification than is required, would grumble?—No, so long as the teachers were doing their duty.

162. You do not think such a system of classification would injuriously affect the interests of teachers in the service of Boards at the present time?—I do not think so.

163. Do you know anything of the working of training-colleges in this colony?—I know the Training-college in Dunedin.

164. Is it a college for the training of teachers or the instruction of teachers, in the main?—I should say it was for both—in the main, for the instruction of teachers.

165. Do these colleges come up to your idea of what training-colleges should be?—No, my idea goes somewhat further; I think they should be better staffed. I saw the Training-college in Melbourne towards the end of last year, and I would like to see training-colleges established here on the same principle: a competent instructor for kindergarten work, for drawing, for science, for the giving of object-lessons, and for the training of teachers; at the head of all an enthusiast—a man deeply versed in all educational movements, and acquainted with all the great educational reforms of the past. The wider outlook he had the better.

166. You refer to the skilled training of teachers?—Their technical training.

167. Especially technical training?—Yes.

168. And what of literary attainments?—You must have the two going hand-in-hand.

169. Do you object to a pupil who has passed Standard VI. being employed as a pupil-teacher?—No.

170. Do you think it is desirable?—I think it would be more desirable if the Government could sweep away the pupil-teacher system.

171. If you could arrange matters so that a pupil-teacher should have at least passed an examination equal to the matriculation before entering, do you think it would be desirable?—No; I should not lay down such a high standard.

172. What age would you require a candidate for pupil-teachership to be?—If you are going to keep the pupil-teacher system, I should say let it be the Sixth Standard, as at present.

173. Do you think it would be desirable to put into a school a junior assistant instead of a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

174. I assume you mean the junior assistant to be an ex-pupil-teacher: would an ex-pupil-teacher meet your requirements in that case as a junior assistant?—Yes.

175. You said that a pupil-teacher, when transferred to another school, had to contend with difficulties in the matter of school-management, drawing up time-tables, &c.: do you not think that, instead of having a young pupil-teacher like that, it would be better to have a matriculated student, and put that student into one of the town schools for training before sending him into the country—let him be trained for, say, twelve months in the art of school-management, &c.?—It depends on the individual, and whether the twelve months would be as good as the four or five years.

176. You think that the ex-pupil-teacher would be preferable?—It depends on the individual again, and the training-college.

177. I refer to a training-school, and not a training-college?—If the student got the training it is probable he would be the better; on the other hand, I do not think that one year would give him that particular skill that a pupil-teacher would acquire in four or five years. If the Government could provide for all the pupil-teachers, I should say the pupil-teachers should go to the training-colleges at the university centres.

178. I suppose you find that your female assistants, as far as you have had experience of them, work well in the schools?—Yes.

179. Are they fairly classed as teachers?—They are fairly efficient teachers, yes.

180. Do you find that the system of giving bonuses acts as an incentive to them to work?—I am not sufficiently long here to say.

181. As to payments on average attendance, you are aware that the capitation grant is paid to Education Boards for average attendance?—Yes.

182. Do you think that a fairer plan would be to pay on the number present in a school rather than on the average attendance?—It is a point I have not gone into carefully enough to answer. I think, on the whole, it would be fairer to pay on the number that had been present at the school.

TUESDAY, 11TH JUNE, 1901.

Dr. SMYTH's examination continued.

183. *Mr. Hill.*] What is your opinion as to the right of the Education Board to transfer teachers without reference to School Committees?—I should like to see the power vested in the Board.

184. Do you think that would be beneficial to the promotion of education in your district?—That is my opinion.

185. Do you find sometimes that even a good teacher seems unadapted to a particular district?—I have not enough experience to say; I am only judging from the experience of others. Since I came here I have found teachers who are doing good work in some districts, whilst in other districts they have not done such good work.

186. Suppose an Inspector reported that the difficulties of a teacher were such as to make it desirable that there should be a change, would you give the right to remove him absolutely to the Education Board of the district?—Yes. But the Inspector would have to be apprised of all the facts.

187. He would supply the facts?—Yes, he would.

188. Do you not think that if certification, classification, and transferring were entirely in the hands of the central department the difficulties would be minimised?—That, of course, is granted.

189. You think that centralisation of the teachers would be better?—I do not say so; but if you wish me to tell you how the teachers from one end of the colony to the other could be most easily (I do not say best) worked, I say that the central department can do it more easily than the Education Board.

190. Centralisation would minimise the difficulties relating to the removal of teachers?—Yes.

191. *Mr. Smith.*] Are there five relieving-teachers permanently engaged in this district?—Yes. They are engaged, when not relieving, at one of our larger schools. I think we have two in Palmerston, two in Wanganui, and one in Hawera.

192. They are extra members of the staff of these schools?—Yes.

193. And they have a fixed salary?—So I understand, and they can be moved at a moment's notice.

194. *Mr. Weston.*] You advocated, I think, the power of removal and transfer being given to the Boards?—Yes, I did.

195. I suppose the logical outcome of that would mean that you would advocate the appointment of teachers by the Board without reference to the Committees?—That is so.

196. Do you think that pupil-teachers in this district receive sufficient instruction?—My answer depends on the point of view. If you mean to ask me if the teachers do their duty by the pupil-teachers, I say in the main they do; if you ask me if they are properly equipped for the duties the syllabus requires of them, I say No.

197. Do you think it is right for pupil-teachers to be employed during the whole of a school-day?—I should say, No; but the pupil-teacher system being what it is, and the practical exigencies of the profession being what they are, as far as I can see, they have to be employed the whole day.

198. What proportion of the school-day do you think should be given to teaching, and what part should be devoted to study by the pupil-teacher?—If it were possible, half-and-half would probably be preferable.

199. Do you think that pupil-teachers passing in this district could stand side by side with teachers trained as pupil-teachers, and afterwards in the Training-school at Christchurch?—I should say, No.

200. Then, if we are to have a colonial scale of staffs and salaries, is it not necessary that steps should be taken to equalise the value of the pupil-teachers throughout the colony?—That is exactly my position.

201. That is the logical outcome of it?—That is so.

202. Do you not think, then, that steps should be taken by the Government to see that all pupil-teachers in the colony have equal advantages?—I do.

203. You are acquainted, I presume, with the school-buildings of this district?—I know a little about them; I have been in a number of them.

204. If the Inspector-General's scale were adopted, do you think an outlay in the alteration of the school-buildings would become necessary?—In a number of them it would. If the alternative scheme were adopted two teachers would manage a school up to an average of 90. We have one or two schools in our district with three rooms and an average of 80, but no two rooms would hold all the pupils.

205. Would your remarks apply to many schools in your district?—There is this to be said: We have a number of schools built for 60 pupils with one room, and two teachers work there now. The difference is, however, that now a master and a pupil-teacher work in the room, but under the amended scale it will be probably a master and mistress.

206. And, therefore, accommodation that would have sufficed for a master and a pupil-teacher might prove insufficient for two teachers?—That is so.

207. Do you think that a month's pay is sufficient for a teacher on sick-leave, and more especially in the case of a teacher of long standing?—No, I do not.

208. What, in your opinion, should the sick-allowance be?—Individual cases may differ. One teacher may be absent three months; another two months. I should say you should have a sliding system applicable to the time a teacher is absent.

209. Except in the case where the absent teacher is of very recent appointment, do you think a month's pay is sufficiently liberal?—Not if absent from the school for a longer period of time.

210. What do you think would be a fair amount to pay to a teacher's widow upon his death?—I have not thought of it at all.

211. You advocate a colonial scale of salaries: do you not think that if the Board were in a position to pay fair and equitable salaries, it would be better for that matter to be left entirely with the Board?—Do you mean fair and equitable for Otago, Canterbury, or Wanganui, or do you mean is it possible to have fair and equitable salaries for the colony?

212. In the formation of a scale, would it not be fair and equitable for a Board to take into consideration the circumstances of its particular district?—If the Auckland Board can make a scale that would be just and equitable for the huge territory over which it has control, it seems to me to be just as easy to have a scheme for the whole of the colony.

213. You stand hard and fast by the colonial scale of salaries?—I stand by it.

214. Then, if you think there should be a fixed scale of staffs and salaries, why did you say yesterday that you thought there should be a certain amount of elasticity in the scale of staffing—because directly you introduce elasticity it seems to me you must more or less depart from a particular scale?—I suppose the question is whether it be more or less.

215. Once you allow latitude in the number of children a teacher should teach, there is a departure from the scale of staffing?—Yes, but only within certain defined limits.

216. Is there not still discretion left with the Board in its staffing?—Yes; but if you wish to stretch the point much further and say, would I rather hold by giving this, or fall back on the rigid system, I would rather fall back on the rigid system.

217. If a national system is to be introduced, and if that national system must necessarily involve rigidity as against elasticity, would you stand by rigidity?—Yes.

218. I do not, of course, understand you to say that it must necessarily be rigid?—That is so.

219. *Mr. Hogben.*] You were present at the conference of Inspectors this year?—Yes.

220. I presume, in regard to staffing, that it would be your opinion that the Inspectors are the expert advisers of the Board?—Yes.

221. Do you remember that this resolution was carried: "That it is desirable that there should be a uniform scale of staffs for the colony"?—Yes.

222. That, of course, you would not take to exclude a certain amount of elasticity?—Certainly not.

223. Supposing there was a uniform scale of staffing introduced for the colony, would such elasticity as is indicated by this be sufficient—that two pupil-teachers might be replaced by one assistant?—I might, under certain circumstances, say Yes to that—so long as it is understood that the system was not too widely departed from.

224. Only within certain limits?—Yes; I would not allow all the pupil-teachers to be replaced by assistants.

225. One senior assistant to replace one junior assistant and one pupil-teacher?—Yes.

226. And suppose in a school under 400 only one such change was allowed to take place, and in a school over 400 only two such changes were allowed to take place, would that be a sufficient safeguard?—Yes, I should agree to that.

227. Although you have not quite made up your mind as to the limits that might be allowed, these appear to you to be possible working limits?—Yes.

228. Now, would you go further than that: would you allow discretion to a Board to change the rule by which a qualified assistant is the first addition to the staff when a school ceases to be under the charge of a sole teacher?—No, I would not go that length.

229. Then, there are certain limits on which your mind is already firmly made up?—Yes, that is so.

230. With regard to the question of sick-leave: if the Boards had means granted to them to provide for a certain number of relieving-teachers, then the payment of the teachers who were absent would proceed without disturbance of the scale of staffs and salaries?—That is so.

231. According to the scale of the Wanganui Board, what would be the salary payable to the first assistant in the Wanganui Boys' School?—£190, I understand it to be: that is, of course, counting his bonus—£160 salary *plus* £30 bonus.

232. What certificate has he?—E1.

233. Supposing he had a D3, what would he get?—£5 less.

234. Or an E2?—£5 less.

235. If he had a D1 he would get £5 more?—Yes.

236. He gets practically £5 taken off, because he has E1 instead of D1?—That is so.

237. That is really more than 2½ per cent.?—Yes.

238. That is a larger deduction than is recognised in the suggested scale?—Yes, if you look at it in that way.

239. Is it not practically the same whether you add the bonus to the lower scale or make deductions from the higher?—That is so.

240. Would you be in favour of taking out of the suggested scale all these deductions, and leaving the certificates to have their own weight in the appointment of teachers?—I should rather allow them to remain in some such way as at present.

241. *The Chairman.*] Do you consider we have not a national system of education in New Zealand at present?—That depends on the meaning given to the term "national"; we have one syllabus and one Education Act, but we have not one scale of salaries right through, nor one scale of staffing right through; pupil-teachers are trained differently in different parts, and there are different examinations for pupil-teachers. Some Boards afford training for their pupil-teachers by sending them to a training-college. I do not think that while these differences exist we can say we have a national system. It is national as far as it goes.

242. You think there must be uniformity to make it national?—Yes.

243. Do you require uniformity in every detail to constitute a national system?—We must have greater uniformity than we have before we could call our system national.

244. Do you think it necessary to a national system of education that we should have training-schools and universities in every educational centre?—No; but similar opportunities must be given to teachers.

245. Have you formed an opinion as to which of the schemes before the Commission should be adopted?—I prefer the alternative.

246. In your own district would that lead to any material alteration in the staffing: would there be a reduction or an increase?—In a number of schools the staffing would remain just as at present, but on the whole the staffing would be increased.

247. Do you think a further improvement would not be made by again reducing the staffing, and so giving an additional increase in the salaries?—I would not wish to go very much further in that direction. It might, however, be advisable to give the first assistance at 45 instead of 40.

248. If a colonial scheme of salaries is adopted, do you not think it will lead to the abolition of the capitation system altogether?—Probably it will.

249. With regard to appointments: if there is a colonial scale of salaries adopted, do you not think appointments should be left to the department solely?—No, I do not think so.

250. I think the Inspectors passed a resolution in favour of placing themselves under the department: does not their generous instinct go as far as the teachers also?—That question was not discussed at all.

251. If the capitation system is abolished, do you think there is any security that the scale will be continued from year to year?—I do not see any reason why it should not be continued.

252. Do you see any probability of its continuance?—I should say the probability is that it would continue.

253. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you want, in your schools, uniformity or adaptation to operate so far as actual teaching is concerned?—Adaptability.

254. You do not want teachers throughout the district to have the very same subjects to teach?—There are certain subjects that I think essential to be taught in every school, but subjects such as object-lessons and science the teacher should be allowed to assert his individuality in.

255. *Mr. Weston.*] Speaking logically, is not the idea of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries a matter quite outside and beyond the Education Act?—I suppose I should say, Yes, if we understand each other aright.

256. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Have you noticed in the youth of New Zealand a very marked cockney accent?—No, I have not.

257. Have you noticed this kind of accent in the colony: "On a trine, sime as mine . . . and a plite of best mixed biscuits and extravagance in cike"?—I have heard of there being not only here in New Zealand, but also in Victoria, an accent of that kind, but I have not come across it myself.

258. You have not noticed it in this education district?—I have not only not noticed it here, but I have not noticed it anywhere else.

259. Do you not think that teachers might not be conscious of it?—It may be so.

260. Of course, if children go to other parts of the world, such as England, I suppose you are aware that it is a great drawback to them to have such an accent?—That is so.

261. Would you consider that we have a national system of surveying carried on in this country?—I am not enough acquainted with it to know.

262. In all countries where you have varying conditions, such as we have here, there are bound to be differences?—For a time.

263. Do you not think that the man who, owing to climatic conditions in Otago, can efficiently teach 45 children should get a higher wage than the man in the North, who, for the same reason, cannot teach more than 35?—Certainly not; because, as long as he is doing as much as he is able to do, he is doing as much as the man in Otago.

264. Then, it is not by results you are going to pay, but by the capacity of the person to do work?—No; I took you on your statement as to climatic conditions. I do not myself agree that there are those climatic conditions.

265. Do you not consider that the discontent of teachers has arisen from the lack of the prospect of promotion, as well as from the reductions they have suffered at the hands of the Education Boards?—That is probably so.

266. Do you think that the Education Boards, with the money at their disposal, have not done as much as they possibly could for the teachers under their control?—As far as I know them, they have.

267. Do you think, then, that the same sum of money in the hands of the Government, and distributed by the central authority, would have secured greater satisfaction to the teachers?—It would have made them more and more alike.

268. You wish, of course, to see salaries paid up to the level of the highest scale existing in the colony?—Exactly.

269. And if a £4 grant is not sufficient you would be in favour of a larger grant being given?—Yes.

270. It is not your desire to see salaries brought down at all?—No.

Mr. George Grant, Headmaster, College Street School, Palmerston North, examined

Mr. Grant: With regard to myself, I have been nearly twenty years in the service of this Board as a teacher in charge of schools ranging from 35 to 350, and I am bound to admit that until quite recently there was very general satisfaction with the salaries throughout the district. Two years ago the Board, finding itself with a deficit, notified that an all-round reduction of 5 per cent. on salaries was to be made; that payment for the instruction of pupil-teachers was to cease;

that house allowance would be abolished; and that Truant Officers were to be dispensed with. At a meeting of teachers held immediately after this notice was issued it was decided to submit to the Board a proposal that the reduction should be on salaries only, and on a graduated scale. We recognised that it would be extremely hard on teachers with low salaries if 5 per cent. were taken from them, and we proposed that, on salaries under £100, 2½ per cent. should be deducted; under £150, 3¾ per cent.; £200, 5 per cent; and £250 and upwards, 6¼ per cent. The saving to be effected by that means just about met what was required by the Board, and the Board accepted the suggested graduated reductions. To this hour we are paid on the old scale, with an entry on our pay schedules that a reduction at such-and-such a rate is taken off. But there has never been, to my knowledge, anything like satisfaction with the staffing of the schools; and, thanks to the existence of the Teachers' Institute, by which we have gained knowledge of the conditions prevailing in other districts, we have found increasing cause for dissatisfaction with the staffing. The first evil I wish to refer to is with regard to the pupil-teachers. We have pupil-teachers ranging from those who are mere beginners to those who have served four years' apprenticeship, *plus* two or three years after pupil-teachership has closed; and it is quite a frequent thing that there will be withdrawn from the staff of a school a pupil-teacher of a very high degree of fitness, and substituted for him, as if his power were equal, a mere beginner. Now, head-teachers feel that pupil-teachers should be graded, and not held all alike responsible for a certain number of pupils on the roll. While one pupil-teacher may control 30 children without difficulty, and be a very valuable member of the school staff, another may require, practically, the head-teacher's presence and assistance all day long. In this district there are most unaccountable transfers of teachers. I heard a young lady boast the other day that she had just entered her sixth school this year—a pupil-teacher in ordinary service. Another difficulty that we experience is this: Every assistant teacher, whether first, second, third, or fourth, is held accountable for 60 pupils. There is an intermediate stage recognised by this Board, which is a very valuable one—that of the so-called junior assistant. When a pupil-teacher has continued in the service with satisfaction to the Board for two or three years after finishing his pupil-teachership, and has not yet obtained an assistantship, the rank of junior assistant is given; and he is held responsible for 45 pupils. Otherwise all assistant teachers are supposed to have under their care 60 pupils; but I know of no way of organizing a school by which a fair distribution of pupils to assistants can be made in such a manner. My own method would be to give sections of different standards to each assistant, and allow the assistants to conduct these sections as if they were teaching small country schools. This, however, is merely a theory, and has not been reduced to practice. My difficulty is that in a school of 300 and upwards the first assistant is usually intrusted with the Fifth Standard, which, in such a school, has rarely more than 40 pupils; whereas the lowest grade of assistant is placed in charge of Standard I. or Standard II., and will have in such a school 60 to 80 pupils. As a matter of fact, we have been able to keep our schools going only by throwing upon the infant-teacher an excessive number of pupils. Therefore the present scale of staffing would have been impossible in a district like Wanganui—that is, impossible to get anything like satisfactory results—without adopting the vicious system of employing unpaid cadets. That is to say, pupils who desire to enter the service are recognised as part of the school staff, and, while not regarded as responsible for any of the pupils, they have practically to do pupil-teacher work. In addition to that, the employment of monitors and monitresses has been introduced, and children have been drawn from their class-work to assist in the management of sections of the lower classes. The assistants themselves, under such conditions, become dissatisfied. While salaries fluctuate with the general roll-number, there is no fluctuation with the class roll-number of that particular assistant. If a teacher who taught 30 had to be paid on the number taught, one cause of complaint might be removed. In view of these things, I may say that all the teachers in this district who know the position have consistently, for years past, advocated a colonial scale of staffs and salaries. The teachers in this district, generally speaking, advocate—perhaps not so universally as a colonial scale—centralisation, and the abolition of Board control. The reason for that is that, under the administration of the Board, transfers which are necessary are almost unattainable. In all the years in which I have been in the Board's service I know of only two cases in which teachers have been able to effect an exchange, and in both cases the transfer was truly beneficial, and was attended with eminently satisfactory results. If a system of transfer were adopted, in many cases, instead of long-continued wrangling between teachers and Committees, teachers and Boards, or teachers and Inspectors, the difficulty would be solved immediately. My branch of the Institute has passed a resolution that any colonial scheme is essentially incomplete and practically inoperative that does not place under the control of the central department the power of transfer, promotion, removal, and dismissal of teachers. Now, we hold that a colonial scale, to be generally acceptable, should be characterized by a simple grouping of schools for salary purposes—that is to say, instead of grouping them into small sections, as is done in the proposed schemes, schools should be grouped into aided schools (which must be treated as exceptional), and then grades of 20 to 75, 75 to 150, 150 to 250, 250 to 350, and so on. Instead of the shorter steps of 20 or 30 between grade and grade, the interval should be very much enlarged. The reason is that in a small school a teacher is really working up to the full limit of his or her strength, even if the school has only 30 pupils, and in a country district the personality of a teacher is of very great importance. A teacher of 50 children in a country school has a much more important position than an assistant with 50 children in a town school. Under the London School Board, schools are grouped by hundreds for salaries (*vide* Code of Regulations, page 131.) In Edinburgh it is the same. In the Scotch provincial districts it is by 75 at a time. I regard the proposal to give a *per capita* allowance as a very objectionable one. It will certainly spread among teachers a most unhappy spirit of rivalry—to increase their roll-number—and I think it will do much to break up the present *esprit de corps* among the body

of teachers. Another objection is that it gives to the quarrelsome parent a means of inflicting a direct injury on the teacher with whom that parent may choose to quarrel, for the taking-away of one child from a school is felt by a corresponding decrease in salary. In small country schools where a capitation allowance of £5 is to be given it is a grave wrong to young teachers to place the temptation in their path to increase their roll-number by unfair means. Young teachers, realising that their almost inadequate salary will be increased by £5 by reason of their average attendance increasing one unit, are surely under a temptation that they should not be subjected to —to falsify their registers. I make those remarks with the greatest diffidence, for the reason that it seems to throw an imputation on the character of teachers, I only wish to point it out as a possible danger. We are all dissatisfied with the fluctations that ensue from the varying results of paying salaries on quarterly returns. The eccentric climate of New Zealand, the succession of epidemics, and other ills which we have suffered have caused serious losses to teachers. I can cite the case of a teacher who, to allay a local scare, kept his school open while diphtheria was raging in his district, and by his heroism suffered a loss of £30 a year in salary, and of two members of his staff; while another man who simply locked up his school, and had a three-months spell, was unaffected either in salary or in staff. I would suggest that the best possible basis on which salaries might be computed should be the actual number present on the day of the annual examination. We recognise that as the high-water mark of attendance. We are required to show in the schedules the number of attendances made by each pupil. I should be disposed to eliminate all who had not made twenty half-day attendances. Then there would be given the real efficient strength of the school on the day of the Inspector's visit. All along I have been an advocate for the superannuation of teachers. Some of the members of the Commission will remember that on two occasions I submitted to the Government Actuary, through the Institute, superannuation schemes. The last scheme, which was based on the Police and Post Office schemes of the Home-country, was rejected by the Government Actuary solely on the ground that the benefits proposed exceeded the funds provided. I would advocate compulsory deductions from teachers' salaries—with forfeiture in case of dismissal—and a subsidy of £1 for £1 by the Government. Instead of having a fixed salary for a position there should be some elasticity. Nothing eats the heart out of a teacher so much as to remain at a standstill and work on year after year without an increase in salary, or any hope of an increase. It is desirable that changes of teachers should be as infrequent as possible, but if a teacher has been in the service nine or ten years without an increase of salary that teacher is apt to lose heart. I should therefore have a minimum salary for every position, with regular increases of £5 a year for every year of satisfactory service, in the case of male teachers, and £4 a year in the case of female teachers, in all grades. After they had continued in the service a certain number of years they would reach the maximum salaries of their grades. A teacher, when he had reached years of maturity, would then feel himself as far advanced in the matter of salary as he could hope for, and would enter into that quiet content which characterizes most men when they get up in years. Another matter I should like to refer to is house-rent. In the Palmerston district, where we have three schools with an attendance each of from 250 to 400 pupils, no residences are provided by this Board. The Board pays £20 a year house allowance, but not one of us could find a house suitable to live in—in Palmerston, at all events—for less than £45 a year. When we approached the Board on this matter, instancing the fact that the headmaster of the Wanganui Boys' School was paid £40, they threatened to reduce him from £40 to £20, and but for a vigorous protest on his part would have done so. The Board then said to us that they would build us houses. I think we are all owners of the residences we live in, and to turn us out and compel us to live in the buildings they would erect for us would be a very great hardship indeed. I think a *pro ratâ* allowance for house-rent would be an equitable arrangement. With regard to sick-leave, I think that the frequency of absence of some teachers is a very grave evil. There are some teachers who are practically chronic invalids, and they require a week or ten days off with most disturbing frequency. This is especially so in the case of female teachers, and I urge that this fact should be a grave disqualification in regard to the employment of female teachers. Provision should, however, be made for cases of grave illness probably induced by excessive strain put on the teacher, with the result that that teacher may for three or six months be unfit for duty. I can think of several such cases in this district. I would suggest, as a fair provision for sick-leave, that not oftener than once in five years a teacher should be allowed three months' absence on sick-leave on full pay, and, if necessary, an additional three months on half-pay, and in cases of longer absence forfeiture of salary. Minor illnesses should be dealt with as they arise. This, I think, would do a great deal to minimise the frequency of applications for sick-leave. Of course, the Board insists on a medical certificate being given in all cases, but medical certificates unfortunately in this country, as we all know, can be practically obtained for anything. I was very much pleased that the Chief Inspector in this district suggested that, whatever scheme of staffing we adopted, provision should be made for allowing as an alternative, an assistant teacher for two pupil-teachers, and *vice versâ*. Two pupil-teachers are sometimes better than one assistant, on account of the peculiar arrangement of some of the school-buildings, no matter how capable that assistant may be. I would deprecate the term "infant mistress." It suggests divided authority, or, rather, it suggests to the head-teacher that he is practically exempted from all responsibility with regard to his infant department. I think that a head-teacher should never be encouraged to believe that he has less responsibility for the younger pupils in the lower classes than he has for the older pupils in the upper classes, and I would suggest that the word "teacher" should be substituted for "mistress." The designation should be "infant teacher" rather than "infant mistress." My own experience and observation go to show that it is not the long-experienced lady teacher who is best fitted to take charge of infants. The very "cream" of an infant-teacher's work is got between twenty and thirty years of age. After that they lose vitality. Women cease to progress at an earlier age than men. Again, women are much inferior in initiative, and they

are strangely deficient in powers of endurance as compared with men. Therefore when you are fixing the proposed salary to an infant-teacher the fact that she must or should be a lady between twenty and thirty years of age should be taken into account. Of course, I know that in this colony there are striking exceptions to what I have just stated. Some women could not be anything else but infant-teachers, so specially endowed are they for the work. The only injustice in salaries we have been able to lay our finger upon in the two scales is that proposed to be done to the first male assistants. Why is it that in the larger schools—I mean schools of 300 in attendance and upwards—the first male assistants are to be treated in a most ungenerous fashion? Just such a teacher is the best that can be found for one of the larger country schools, and he has duties that make him more than a mere class-teacher. He is the lieutenant in command, and his personality counts for much in the school. He has nearly always to take charge of the boys in matters such as drill and playground exercises. I strongly deprecate the present system of choosing pupil-teachers. A difficulty has always been found in getting boys to become pupil-teachers, and I have not, so far, seen what I believe to be the true explanation of the difficulty. I believe that boys are so constituted that they cannot come straight from their standard classes to take charge of half a dozen children learning the A.B.C. In five minutes a girl can do it. The power of control comes to her instinctively, and girls are eager to do the work. If a Standard VII. boy be put in charge of a lower class (who is manly in every respect) he looks very much out of place, and has the feeling that there is something ludicrous about it. I am certain that that has something to do with the unwillingness of boys to become pupil-teachers, and I should get over the difficulty by a different method of choosing pupil-teachers. Let those who aspire to be teachers be reported on by the head-teacher or the Inspector, and let it be the rule that they shall not handle a class until they have passed an examination equal to that required for an E certificate. They would then be about seventeen or eighteen years of age, and they should be then required to take a three-years probationship, and have an annual examination in school method and management. At present young teachers seem to regard the possibilities of wriggling through their professional examinations with a minimum of preparation rather than the thorough fitting of themselves for their calling. They seem to regard school method and all that appertains to their professional studies as being of minor importance. Until we have a degree of pedagogy we shall not have professional training made anything like complete. One other point I wish to refer to is that I think that Standard VII. pupils should be dealt with in an exceptional manner, and not be included in the average attendance at all. In this district we require from Standard VII. pupils Latin, algebra, and Euclid—that is, in schools with an average attendance of 250; and two things are happening—both evil—under this requirement, which is compulsory. First of all, a teacher doing that sort of work devotes far too much time to it, to the detriment of the rest of his classes; or another teacher, who regards the demand for such work as unfair, performs it in the most perfunctory manner, and there is a make-believe method of working going on in the schools. Teachers should be encouraged to entice Standard VII. pupils to remain in the schools as long as possible, for they are valuable in every sense. I think that if teachers were paid some special rate for their instruction, and they were kept out of the average attendance, it would be a great advantage. I strongly deprecate the proposal to give Inspectors the power of lowering teachers' classification. There are thousands of ways of penalising a teacher other than by branding him forever—for I regard it as that—as having deteriorated in fitness for his work. I would certainly resign my position and take to some other calling if, under any circumstances, an Inspector treated me in that manner. We teachers are emphatically of the opinion that we have not a national system of education at the present time, and we have this opinion forced upon us continually. In a colony like this the conditions of our lives should be made, as far as educational attainments are concerned, as nearly uniform as possible. But at present the work done in different standards in different districts varies. In some districts it is inferior to the work done in other districts. It is a delusion to imagine that the best work is done in the large schools. The best-taught children are those in schools with an attendance of from 40 to 100 pupils.

271. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You think that the teaching administered in the North is not so good as the teaching in the South, do you?—I once dared at a teachers' meeting to instance where the diversity was very marked, and naturally a very vigorous protest came from that district which I instanced.

272. Would you consider it as an indication of more efficient teaching if a lad who had passed the Fifth Standard in Otago was sent to a Wellington school and was there found to be fit for Standard VI.: would you consider it as an indication of more efficient teaching being given in the South?—I was so severely "mauled" on one occasion I instanced that I am almost afraid to give an opinion.

273. At all events, you think there is a difference in some districts?—Yes, a very marked difference.

274. Do you not think that if there has been a difference in the work of the teachers in some of the districts the work is an equivalent for the salaries paid them?—I think that the difference in salaries has not been the cause of the difference in the work performed. I think it has been entirely the different interpretation put upon the syllabus by Inspectors in their own education districts.

275. I understand that you consider that a female teacher is pretty well worn out at thirty years of age?—She has attained her best, I think, at that period.

276. Do you not think that she should be paid a better salary during the years she is most efficient if her powers are exhausted sooner than a male teacher's?—I have seen so much waste in training female teachers that at the present time, in this district, I think they are paid very fair salaries.

277. There is a difference of 25 per cent. between the salaries paid to male and female teachers in this district, is there not?—Yes.

278. Do you think that is too great a disparity?—No, I do not think it is. I think the average female teacher is very likely to become a selfish person, spending all she earns upon herself, having no claims upon her.

279. Regarding a superannuation scheme for teachers: I was glad to hear you say—at least, I took it as such—that so-much should be deducted compulsorily from the salaries of teachers under the contemplated scheme of payments: do you think it is within the capacity of the teachers to make contributions towards a superannuation fund?—We have discovered our ability to bear the deduction that was made upon us two years ago.

280. You do not think it would be a hardship to ask the teachers to bear a reduction from their increased salaries under the proposed scale?—No.

281. At what age do you think a teacher should be retired?—Well, I do not think that many of the teachers would agree with me. I consider that a male teacher has reached his best at forty-five years of age, and from forty-five to sixty or sixty-five he should be allowed to taper off.

282. At what age would you retire an Inspector?—I have not the experience to say.

283. Are you in favour of a colonial scale?—Emphatically so.

284. Do you think that the Inspectors should be colonial officers or Board officers?—Colonial officers under the control of the central department.

285. If that was so, what functions would you give to the Boards—or would you consider that Boards were unnecessary?—I have very great difficulty in answering that question. It seems to me that Boards would still have the direct administration of affairs within their own education districts.

286. What administration would Boards have if they had not the appointment of teachers?—You are supposing that I am advocating the appointment of teachers by the central department also?

287. Yes; what is your opinion then?—As a natural sequence of that, I would take it that there would be the abolition of Boards.

288. Have you thought of the question of a Board for the North Island and one for the South Island?—In the event of the "wiping-out" of Education Boards, I would intrust some of the administration to Borough Councils, County Councils, and other local bodies.

289. Do you think that Borough Councils and County Councils are specially qualified for the work?—The work would become part of their duties.

290. Have you had any experience of Borough Councils and County Councils? Are the members who compose those bodies giants of intellect: would you intrust your fate to them?—I am supposing that the promotion and transfer of teachers has been taken over by the central department. I do not know the functions of Education Boards outside the controlling of teachers.

291. Surely you know something of the functions of Education Boards after working under them? You say that you do not know the functions of Boards outside of the appointment of teachers?—That is so; perhaps a little thought would enable me to answer you—*e.g.*, the erection and maintenance of buildings.

292. Do you suggest the centralising of those functions which you mention because you think that Boards have not done their work well in the past?—There have been grave inequalities which tend to denationalise our education system.

293. Is it not a fact that Boards have continued the existing principles from the provincial days?—I cannot speak as to that.

294. You will not hold fast to the statement you made that Boards created the inequalities you spoke of?—They have at least perpetuated them.

295. If the Education Boards had the money to distribute that these schemes contemplate, do you think that the Boards could not distribute the money as well as the central department?—I think not.

296. Why?—For the reason that they would be constantly attempting to adapt the means at their disposal to local conditions.

297. Would that be a bad principle?—Well, the local conditions might be purely imaginary.

298. You stated just now that the Boards might adapt their means to local conditions: I understand you mean actual local conditions and not imaginary ones?—I think that local conditions should not be allowed to destroy the uniformity of the system as a whole.

299. Do not local conditions enter into all systems of administration?—No doubt.

300. Then, do you think it is wrong that they should enter into the question of the payment of teachers and the administration of the system of education?—I think, in that matter, the immediate effect would be to cause grave inequality.

301. You mean that at the present time inequalities exist?—Yes.

302. Have those inequalities not arisen from the fact that the Government has not given the different Boards the means to carry out their functions in such a manner as to prevent those complications?—Yes.

303. Then, if the Government has been the primary cause of the inability of the Boards to do otherwise than they have done, is it not unjust to blame the Boards?—I do not blame the members of the Boards.

304. I speak of the Boards, and want your opinion?—The system of Board administration is to blame.

305. I want to know this: If the Government has not given the Boards means to do otherwise than has been done, is it the fault of the Boards or the fault of the Government?—It is the fault of the Boards' system of administration.

306. How can that be so if the Boards have not had the means of doing otherwise than has been done?—Because the Boards have created such school districts as should not exist.

307. The Boards did not create the districts; the Government did so. I want a direct answer

to my former question, as to whether the fault is the Government's or the Boards' ?—I do not mean to throw the responsibility on the Boards.

308. If the Boards reduced salaries fourteen years ago, was that not for the reason that the Government reduced the amount of capitation grant by 5s. *per capita*, and altered the payments from the roll attendance to the average attendance?—Yes.

309. Was that not the cause of grave dissatisfaction on the part of the teachers?—Yes.

310. Then, was it the fault of the Government or the fault of the Boards?—The fault of the Government.

311. Very well; you admit it was the fault of the Government, and that it was the cause of grave dissatisfaction, and yet you ask for the whole of certain powers to be placed in the hands of the Government?—Yes.

312. Does that not appear to be illogical?—No.

313. You say that the motion that you read from your Institute recommended that powers should be placed in the hands of the central department for promotion, removal, and dismissal of teachers?—Yes, that is so.

314. That is the view of the teachers?—Yes.

315. That the central authority should have the whole power of promotion, transfer, removal, and dismissal?—Yes.

316. What do you think the view of the public should be on that: do you think that the parents should have no say whatever in the appointment of a teacher, seeing their children are perhaps to receive education from that particular teacher?—I am quite prepared to say that the condition of things which has existed hitherto——

317. I am not speaking as to the conditions that existed hitherto. You say that the teachers want the whole of certain powers placed in the hands of the central department: I ask—contingent upon that—if you think the people would be content to have no voice in the matter?—I think the people would accept appointments made by the central department finally, although perhaps they would not at first prefer it to the Boards.

318. If such a trouble existed in the exchange of a teacher from one district to another, subject even now to consultation—for I think you stated that consultation was a drawback—if such trouble now exists after consultation, do you think it is likely to cease altogether if Boards have no voice in the matter at all?—Yes, I am sure it would. As soon as a teacher is chosen by a School Committee, almost invariably there rises up in that district a protest against the choice—another candidate has his own body of supporters.

319. Not invariably surely?—Well, frequently. If a teacher goes to a district with the knowledge that the majority of the residents have been opposed to his appointment, it is a very grave disadvantage to that teacher.

320. What do you think the minimum salary for a teacher should be in a school that the teacher may have complete charge of?—I think, in this country, that no male teacher should be paid less than £150 a year.

321. And what is the minimum salary you would fix for a female teacher under similar circumstances?—£100.

322. Is it not a fact that in a small school, say, of 25 in attendance a female teacher is required to first of all possess as high qualifications, to bring out the same results, and be altogether as well adapted for the charge of a school of that sort as a male teacher?—Yes.

323. Then, do you not think that a difference of £50 in salary is somewhat unreasonable?—Personally, I cannot conceive—I have never known—any woman in charge of such a school doing equal work to that which a male teacher would do.

324. In a school of 20 pupils in attendance have you not known the work of a female to be equal to that of a male?—Schools of from 20 to 45 in average attendance are the schools women would have to work as teachers in charge.

325. I am speaking of schools of 20 in average attendance?—I can recall instances of women teachers being in charge of small schools in this district, but when the children reached the Fourth Standard they had to ride five or six miles to attend another school.

326. Referring once more to the appointment of teachers by a central authority, do you not think it might become a question of political influence—the appointment of teachers through the Government?—It has not struck me.

327. Do you not know that all Governments—I do not refer to the present Government—have been largely influenced in the matter of appointments by political supporters—appointments to certain high positions, even in the Police, for instance, and in the Railway Department?—Probably; I have not followed the matter closely to know that it is an actual fact.

328. Would you be surprised to know that it is an actual fact—that supporters can get appointments for friends, and other supporters, when otherwise they would not get appointments?—I think such influences as you suggest would be at a minimum in the Education Department.

329. You do not think that political influence would be brought to bear in the matter of appointments?—I am not afraid of it.

330. Do you think that the wants of a district would be quickly attended to by sending to the central department?—Yes.

331. Have you had anything to do with the needs of people in districts to obtain a post-office or a mail-service?—No.

332. Would you believe that it takes sometimes two years to get a very necessary post-office opened in a district?—Inefficiency in one department does not necessitate inefficiency in another.

333. How long do you think it took to get a railway-siding where absolutely required: would you believe that it has taken six years to get that done?—I know where one has been wanted for twenty years, and it is not there yet.

334. Do you think that in a back bush district—say, a settlement of twenty people—if a railway-siding was wanted, actually required, and they could not get it for six years or twenty years, that if that settlement of people wanted a school established they would get the school any quicker than the railway-siding?—My objection is that Education Boards have been too susceptible to influence that has been brought to bear on them to open schools of convenience.

335. They have attended too closely to the wants of the people, you think?—The tendency has been in every education district in New Zealand to create schools of convenience.

336. Has that been the case in Otago?—I know of at least two schools built in Otago that were not required.

337. Is that the fault of the Government or the Boards?—I have no opinion to express on the matter. It is a matter of supposition.

338. No, it is not; you said that you knew of a certain railway-siding that had not been granted, though it had been wanted for twenty years: I ask you whether, if there was a school in the same district, and the people required a teacher, they would be likely to get the teacher any more quickly from the Education Department than the people requiring the siding were likely to get it from the Railway Department?—If it was a real necessity, I should say that they would receive what they required as readily from the department as from an Education Board.

339. And that might be in twenty years' time, as in the case of the siding?—Yes; but the people were evidently able to get on without the siding.

340. And might they not be able to get on without the school?—Yes.

341. You stated that two schools were built in Otago that were not required: what are the names of those schools?—One was Glenledi and the other was at Round Hill. There was another, I think, at Adam's Flat.

342. Glenledi was never closed down, was it?—I think it was.

343. Was the school not necessary when it was built?—I am not speaking as to that matter.

344. Then, your argument falls to the ground that schools were built that were not required, does it not?—There was no other school within two miles, which fact, no doubt, was in favour of the creation of these schools I have mentioned.

345. The question is, Was Glenledi required?—I am not sfficiently acquainted with the district to say so.

346. Then, if you do not know the requirements of districts, surely it is wrong of you to say that schools were built which were not required. You instanced Glenledi as one in point, and afterwards stated that you did not know whether the needs of the district required its erection?—I take it that it could not have been required, seeing that while it was still a new building it was standing unoccupied.

347. How many years was it open and used before being closed?—I do not know.

348. Might not the fact of its being closed arise through the children attending the school having grown up and the school being no longer required?—No, I do not think so.

349. Are you aware that that school is not closed, and has not been closed for many years?—No.

350. You do not approve of the *per capita* grant?—No.

351. You do not believe in paying on the average attendance?—No.

352. You think it is unfair to the teachers, on the grounds that parents who might have a spite against a teacher would perhaps keep their children away from school, and by decreasing the average attendance lower the salary of the teacher; also that climatic conditions might affect a teacher's average attendance?—Yes, that is quite true.

353. Are the present salaries sufficient to induce bright boys to enter the teaching profession?—I do not think the salaries have anything to do with the question.

354. You quoted the London system of grouping schools; but do you think that system would apply here?—Yes.

355. How many children do you think a teacher should be intrusted with in order to teach them efficiently?—It depends upon the teacher's grade. I should say not more than 40.

356. How many would a teacher of Standards IV., V., or VI. be able to manage?—45.

357. A male or a female teacher?—A male teacher should have charge of the upper standards, and only in very exceptional cases would I put a female teacher in charge of the higher standards.

358. Your suggestion, as I understood, that women's salaries should be stopped when they are away through illness causes one to think that you almost infer their absence from their duties is not caused through illness: is it not an undue reflection on women?—I wish to say so with caution, of course.

359. Regarding the question of house-rent, do you not think it would be better to give teachers a house allowance rather than give them a house, except in the case of country teachers?—Yes.

360. You pleaded better consideration for the assistant teachers: do you not think something should be done for assistants in towns in the matter of house allowance?—Married male assistants, I think, should be granted house allowance.

361. Another thing you stated was in connection with payment on average attendance to teachers, and in this connection you considered that young teachers might be tempted to falsify their school registers?—Yes, that view of the matter struck me as a possible temptation and danger.

362. Has not your experience, or discoveries in that way, shown that it would be probably elder teachers rather than young teachers who would be subjected to the temptation?—I can recall only two cases.

363. Were they young or old teachers?—Teachers of small schools.

364. Yes; but I want to know their ages, approximately?—Certainly they were both under thirty-five years of age.

365. Then, they were not very young teachers?—No.

366. *Mr. Davidson.*] In appearing before this Commission, whom do you represent?—The teachers of the Palmerston North division of the New Zealand Educational Institute.

367. You do not represent the Wanganui Branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute?—The Palmerston section.

368. Could you tell the Commission the number of members in the section?—I do not know at the present time; the secretary is here, and he will be able to tell you.

369. Approximately, how many would there be?—About twenty.

370. You have attended the Council meetings of the New Zealand Educational Institute on several occasions, and, of course, you are aware that representative teachers from every education district in the colony were present?—Yes.

371. Have you ever on any occasion heard the question of centralising our educational system discussed at those Council meetings?—Yes, in various connections.

372. Can you state where, or when?—At Nelson in the first instance, and afterwards at Christchurch.

373. Was there a vote taken on the question?—I am speaking entirely from memory; I have not the report of the proceedings.

374. You would remember if a vote was taken, and the result of that vote, would you not?—I cannot speak from memory.

375. *Mr. Stewart.*] In your opinion, is there general satisfaction among the teachers of the colony at the present time as regards the staffing of schools and more particularly the salaries paid?—There is general dissatisfaction.

376. If a uniform scale of staffing and a uniform scale of salaries was adopted, do you think that would tend to remove the existing dissatisfaction?—It would do very much to allay it.

377. Do you think that the very great inequalities in regard to the salaries paid at the present time has been the principal cause of the dissatisfaction?—In this particular district inequality in regard to staffing has been felt more than the inequality in regard to the salaries.

378. If the inequalities were removed the dissatisfaction would be removed?—Yes.

379. If the teachers of the colony were satisfied on these particular points—of staff and salary—do you not think it would tend to the stability of the Boards rather than to the abolition of the Boards?—There would still remain the difficulty that we as teachers all feel. I refer to the removal, transfer, and appointment of teachers.

380. If you can make the teachers of the colony satisfied by giving them a colonial scale, there is less likelihood of the abolition of Boards, is there not?—There would still remain the dissatisfaction concerning the almost impossibility of passing from one district to another, or passing from one school to another.

381. Would there not be greater possibility of passing from school to school or district to district, if the inequalities in salaries were removed?—Hitherto the Boards have made it impossible for a teacher from another education district to gain a footing anywhere outside his own district.

382. May not a teacher leaving one district for another, perhaps obliged to do so for health's sake, have to be content with a lower salary in the district to which he removes?—I think that is so.

383. You are strongly in favour of a colonial scale for the teachers of the colony because you think it would remove the present existing inequalities?—Yes.

384. *Mr. Luke.*] How many years have you been teaching?—Eighteen years.

385. During those eighteen years have you recognised the good work and the disinterested work done by Education Boards?—Yes, very much indeed.

386. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You say that the teachers whom you represent are all in favour of a colonial scale?—As far as I have been able to ascertain their requirements, they are.

387. Did they pass a resolution to that effect?—Yes.

388. Did they discuss the advisability of differentiating between the work expected from a country teacher—sole teacher—with all standards in his school, and the work that might be expected from a teacher in a large town school that is fully staffed?—The question was discussed incidentally, but not to result in any resolution being passed.

389. What is your opinion on the subject?—That the duties required of the average sole teacher in charge of a country school are much more exacting than those required from a class-teacher, an assistant teacher, in a large town school.

390. Should not a lower standard of work be expected from a country school with all standards than what might be expected from a town school, for example, in such subjects as history, science, and other subjects of a kindred nature that cannot be so efficiently taught; or should a teacher, as far as the class-subjects are concerned, have an alternative?—The teacher should certainly have an alternative on account of the impossibility of giving full attention to certain exceptional subjects.

391. You recognise that Inspectors are the advisers and executive officers of Education Boards, and that anomalies nevertheless exist in the different education districts owing to the diversity of opinions held by the various Inspectors: would it not tend to a uniformity of inspection and examination if Inspectors were placed under the control of the central department?—I think it would.

392. If the cost of the inspectorate was defrayed by the General Government, instead of having to come to a great extent out of the funds of the Boards, there would be more money at the disposal of the Boards for incidental expenses, would there not?—Presumably, yes. I think the grant at present made for inspection purposes is a mere quota of the total cost.

393. The cost of the inspectorate in this district is about £1,000, and the Government allowance only £300: is that so?—Yes.

394. Do you find that teachers leave the service of the Wanganui Board owing to the small remuneration they receive at the hands of the Board?—No.

395. Have you not experienced that in other education districts?—No.

396. Do you consider that the Legislature should define the functions of Committees and Education Boards in the matter of appointments of teachers?—Clearly, yes. This has been a cause of constant dispute, and has introduced very great diversity of method throughout the colony.

397. Do you think that increases to teachers' salaries should be by grades or by units?—Emphatically, by grades.

398. I think that one of the reasons you have against the payment by units was that there might be a tendency on the part of the teachers to falsify their registers?—It is a conceivable evil.

399. Would that evil not be intensified in the case of payment by grades? Suppose a teacher's attendance reached 98 or 99, would it not be a temptation for the teacher to strain his attendance to a point at which he would receive a difference of £25 rather than by a unit for the sake of perhaps 12s.?—Yes; with this difference: such a case as you are supposing would be a very unusual one, whereas the other applies to every teacher throughout the colony.

400. If Inspectors were placed under the control of the central department, and had general instructions to watch very closely any attempt on the part of a teacher to falsify his register, it would preclude any such attempts?—I no not say that danger exists at the present time; it simply struck me as a possible temptation to teachers.

401. With regard to teaching the extra subjects in Standard VII., do you consider that in the case of a school such as yours, where there are a number in the Seventh Standard willing to be taught secondary subjects, that the same remuneration should be given by the department as is given in the case of a district high school?—Yes, if the work is satisfactory.

402. One of the reasons, I believe, why you support the adoption of a colonial scale is to have equal pay for equal work in each education district?—Yes.

403. In practice, there would not be equal pay on account of the difference in the cost of living, would there?—I think the range of the difference in the cost of living in this colony is very narrow.

404. You consider, then, that the difficulty would be no more marked in the case of teachers than what it is in the case of railway servants or officials of the Postal Department?—I think it would be the same all round.

405. Do you consider that the percentage of the working-average is too low?—One becomes so accustomed to 50 per cent.—I have not thought the matter out.

406. I suppose it does not affect schools of the size of yours?—It affects country schools much more.

407. Have the teachers whom you represent expressed any opinion on that subject?—They have sent a special representative from the country to give evidence on that point.

408. Do you consider that teachers should be paid on the highest attendance or on the roll-number?—It strikes me that the most equitable way is the number of pupils actually present on the day of the examination.

409. Would you pay, for the following year, on the total number present on that day?—Yes.

410. Do you find that the Wanganui Board entrenches on the maintenance fund for the purposes of erecting and maintaining buildings?—I do not know of any case in recent years; it did actually happen some years ago.

411. What about house allowance: does not house allowance come out of the maintenance fund?—I do not know the working of the finances of the Board; I am assured by those who know, it is so.

412. If residences were erected the cost would come out of the building grant?—Yes.

413. Do you consider that the Wanganui Board employs an excessive number of pupil-teachers?—Yes.

414. With regard to the teaching of sewing, what provision is made for that in Wanganui?—There is no special provision made. The female teachers take charge of the sewing.

415. Is preference given to female teachers in country schools on account of their ability to teach sewing?—I have not heard so.

416. In the event of there being a male teacher in charge of a country school, you do not know of any provision being made for the tuition of sewing?—I think, on application being made to the Board, a special grant is made.

417. Do you find that candidates for positions under this Board holding the highest certificates are, as a rule, appointed?—No, that is not so.

418. Do you know of canvassing taking place on the part of applicants—the canvassing of School Committees, seeing that it lies in their hands to recommend applicants?—That system has been penalised to the extent of having the applicant disqualified.

419. By whom?—By the Board.

420. Do you know of any case in which a candidate was so disqualified?—No. That regulation came into existence only recently.

421. In reply to Mr. Mackenzie, I think you stated there would be a danger of political influence operating in the event of teachers' appointments taking place?—Mr. Mackenzie suggested that, but I said I did not think it would be so.

422. Do you consider, even if political influence did come into operation, that it would be any worse than the influence brought to bear on Committees by the personal canvass of a candidate or his friends?—I should think not; I am not at all afraid of the evil.

423. In the event of the adoption of a colonial scale of salaries—meaning, in a few cases, reductions—do you consider that those reductions should operate from the date of the introduction of the scale, or should the operation of the reductions be postponed until vacancies were made?—I should prefer the gradual transition.

424. When the Wanganui Board made a reduction in their scale they brought it into force straight away, did they not?—Yes, within three months.

425. Consequently the scale of payment that we see in the rules and regulations of the Wanganui Board is not the actual scale upon which the teachers are paid at the present time?—That is so.

426. Then, when it was stated in evidence this morning that the assistant in the Wanganui Boys' School was getting a salary of £190, or should get that, he is only receiving £182?—Yes, that is so.

427. Do you consider that the salary of a head-teacher in a small country school should be reduced by £10 to pay for the appointment of a sewing-mistress?—No; I think it is an injustice.

428. You do not consider that the salary of a head-teacher should be reduced when an assistant is brought in at 40?—No.

429. Are you aware that is the case in one education district?—No, I am not.

430. Do you favour the establishment of training-colleges in the four large centres, and also the establishment of collegiate classes for the training of ex-pupil-teachers in the smaller towns, such as Wanganui, New Plymouth, and Invercargill?—I have not thought of the former proposal; I strongly favour the establishment of training classes.

431. Would you prefer a system of granting scholarships to the ex-pupil-teachers in the smaller districts to enable them to get one or two years' training in normal schools in the larger centres?—Yes.

432. *Mr. Hill.*] You do not approve of the present mode of staffing the schools in the Wanganui District?—It is generally unsatisfactory.

433. What is the staffing of your own school?—I take charge of Standards VI. and VII. with the help of a pupil-teacher, the first assistant has Standard V., the second assistant Standard IV., the third assistant Standard III., a junior assistant Standard II., an ex-pupil-teacher Standard I., and two pupil-teachers, with a cadet, the infant classes.

434. *Mr. Weston.*] Have you no female teacher?—No mistress.

435. *Mr. Hill.*] No females in your school?—The first assistant is a male, and the other teachers, with the exception of the two pupil teachers, are female teachers. There is no mistress.

436. Do you find that female teachers are less competent than male teachers in managing classes?—Not the lower classes, but in the higher standards it is so.

437. Is there any special reason for giving those teachers the classes you enumerated?—I have found the present organization very satisfactory. My usual method when a new teacher comes into my school is to take that teacher, no matter what rank, into my class-room in order to become familiar with the methods of working the school as a whole. After six or twelve months' such experience that teacher is then given charge of the class he or she seems best adapted for.

438. Your assistant teachers are all certificated?—Yes.

439. Would you deem it your duty, if you thought it proper in the interests of your school, to put the teacher of Standard V. in charge of Standard II., for instance?—Yes; I have repeatedly changed teachers.

440. Your certificated assistants are really class-teachers?—Yes.

441. You give them no other responsibility in the preparation of school-work except the taking of standards?—The first assistant has extra duties. He occasionally supervises model lessons given by pupil-teachers, and takes charge of the boys at drill and on other special occasions.

442. Do your female assistants take any responsibility in overseeing the infant classes?—No.

443. You simply allow your assistants to take charge of their respective standard class?—The teacher in charge of Standard I. has a general oversight of the whole of the infant classes.

444. She is an ex-pupil-teacher?—Yes.

445. You do not give the certificated female assistants any responsibility in the matter of the preparation of the young children?—No.

446. Have you given the pupil-teachers any special training for the teaching of infant children?—Not for any extended period.

447. You recognise that salaries under the proposed or suggested scale are a considerable improvement on the salaries paid by your Education Board at the present time?—Yes.

448. Referring again to the training of infant children, do you not consider it essential that teachers should be trained to take charge of and control the infants?—Yes; but it would be quite impossible to put any of my female assistants in charge of the infant-room.

449. Although your teachers are certificated, and assumed to be trained teachers, they have had no training?—That is so.

450. Yet their certificates have been issued to them as testifying they are qualified to teach infant children?—Yes.

451. There is no educative process or real preparation in the matter of training, it is simply mechanical work the teachers pick up?—That is so.

452. Are you aware that at one time the Government paid a *per capita* allowance of £4 5s.?—Yes.

453. Were the teachers satisfied then?—I do not think there was any dissatisfaction expressed regarding salaries in this district.

454. The Government subsequently withdrew 10s.?—Yes.

455. Do you think the conditions in the various education districts have altered very much in the matter of demanding the opening of schools in the smaller districts?—I think that during the past twelve or thirteen years a very large number of small schools have come into existence.

456. Do you think that has been detrimental or beneficial to teachers in the matter of salaries?—Very detrimental.

457. Then, the Education Boards have been constantly placed under a growing disadvantage? —Yes.

458. You quite recognise that?—Yes.

459. Assume the same conditions existed as formerly in the matter of capitation allowance, do you not think those difficulties would be greatly obviated in the various education districts?—I think it is likely.

460. You said dissatisfaction exists among teachers?—Yes.

461. Would satisfaction ensue if the Boards were provided with the means of paying better salaries?—The inequalities in salaries are not the only grounds of dissatisfaction.

462. Do you think the teachers would receive greater consideration at the hands of a central department than at the hands of Education Boards?—I think the chief benefits of having a central department to control teachers would be the facility which would at once be given for the transfer, promotion, and removal of teachers.

463. Would the central department be likely to know more of teachers than the Education Boards do?—I think the Education Boards at the present time are almost wholly dependent on Inspectors for knowledge concerning their schools.

464. Does that imply that you simply want Inspectors to have the means of promoting teachers?—Yes; I take it that that would be so.

465. Do you find that your lady teachers are often asking for leave of absence on account of sickness?—More frequently than male assistants.

466. What is the salary paid to your first assistant master?—£195, with a bonus.

467. And to the first assistant mistress?—I think, £118.

468. Do you know their certificates?—The male assistant is C2, and the female E2.

469. How many children has your lady assistant who takes Standard IV. to teach?—At present only 48.

470. Is 48 below the average?—Standard III. has 67.

471. And a lady teacher takes that unaided?—Yes.

472. How many are there in Standard VI.?—About 30.

473. And Standard V.?—About 55.

474. Does your first assistant take Standard V. unaided?—Yes.

475. Do you think it is not more difficult to take 55 in Standard V. than 48 in Standard IV.?—Much more difficult, on account of the larger number of children, and the more difficult subjects to be taught.

476. Do you find that lady teachers maintain the discipline as well as males?—In classes of the lower grade.

477. Supposing you placed the first assistant in charge of Standard III., do you think he would produce higher results there than the mistress does?—I think not.

478. You find, of course, that the female pupil-teacher has to work just as hard as the male to get her certificate?—Yes.

479. Why, then, should you differentiate the salaries of male and female teachers?—In the first place, you can exchange the male teacher from Fifth to Third Standard, but you cannot do the other exchange.

480. In a school for girls only, are you aware that lady teachers take the standards just as efficiently as the male teachers do in the boys' schools?—It is quite possible; but they are controlling only girls: they have not mixed classes to control.

481. Do you not think that that influence which we term "womanly influence" operates a great deal in the case of training?—Not wholesomely.

482. You do not think that woman's moral influence and womanly influence operates to the benefit of boys?—I should certainly say it is inferior to the influence exercised by men over boys at that stage.

483. According to what you say, it would be better to place men in charge of unmixed schools?—Not all over. I recognise that in the lower standards females do quite as good work as the men, and exert quite as good an influence over the younger children.

484. In what way does the male influence operate in the case of the girls in the senior classes? —I think, wholesomely—more wholesomely than the female influence over the boys. I think that the upper standards even of girls' schools should be staffed by males.

485. Supposing teachers of the different sexes have the same work up to the Fourth Standard, do you think they should not get the same salary up to that stage?—Yes; not as a matter of equity, but as a matter of finance. The male teacher is available for more duties than the female teacher.

486. You expressed, this morning, the opinion that a better mode of classification of the schools should be adopted. I have before me a plan of classification of schools in which all the schools are placed in ten classes, as follows: Class 1, schools below 20; Class 2, schools between 20 and 30; Class 3, between 30 and 45; Class 4, between 45 and 75; Class 5, between 75 and 110; Class 6, between 110 and 175; Class 7, between 175 and 300; Class 8, between 300 and 500; Class 9, between 500 and 600; and Class 10, between 600 and 700. Now, the first assistant male will receive the same salary as the teacher of a school in the seventh class; the second assistant master in the same school will receive the same salary as the headmaster in a school of the sixth class; the third assistant master will receive the same salary as the principal teacher of a school of the fifth class; the fourth assistant will receive the same salary as the principal teacher of a school of the fourth class. What I want to ask you is this: Do you think, or is it your opinion, that some such lines of equality should be recognised in any generalised scheme of the staffing of schools on a colonial basis?—I thoroughly approve of the principle laid down. I think it is necessary to a colonial scheme.

487. Do you think that that principle of classification would meet with the difficulties which the present proposed classification presents in its adoption as a general scheme?—I think a weakness in the proposed scale is the dealing with male assistants as a distinctive class rather than as being equivalent in salary and status to the head-teachers of schools of lower grades.

488. Do you think that any proposed scale of payment and staffing should deal at all with the classification of teachers by certificate?—I think it would be dangerous to ignore it altogether.

489. When a vacancy takes place, should it not be right and competent for any teacher to apply for that vacancy?—I think not. I think the steps of progression should be in regular succession.

490. You want not merely that there should be a scale of payment and classification, but also that the teachers should be placed directly under the control of the central department?—Yes.

491. You hold that no one else but the central authority should have any right to deal with the question of the employment of teachers in public schools?—Yes, that is so.

492. What length of holidays are usually granted to schools in this district?—Usually five weeks in the midsummer recess, two weeks for midwinter recess, and the ordinary public holidays.

493. Do your Boards or the Committees arrange the holidays—the recess duration?—The Board in every case.

494. Are they the same throughout the whole of the education district?—Yes; with one or two exceptions, for which provision is made. Teachers are allowed to change the midwinter holidays if the annual examination is pending.

495. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] At what time do you think assistance should be given to a sole teacher?—I think, at 45.

496. And the assistance then should be a certificated teacher, I presume?—Certainly; or at least a trained pupil-teacher.

497. A pupil-teacher who has passed through the term of apprenticeship?—That is what I mean.

498. At what salary?—£80 for a male.

499. *Mr. Weston.*] Have the teachers, more especially those composing the Institute which you represent, considered all the points which have been discussed to-day before arriving at the conclusion that a colonial scale of staffs and salaries would be beneficial?—I am conscious that we have been proceeding on destructive rather than constructive lines.

500. Why is the instruction of the infants left to pupil-teachers?—Because pupil-teachers, on account of youth and inexperience, as a rule are not able to take charge of pupils in standards.

501. But do you not think that infants require special treatment in their instruction?—I do; and one of the evils of our present system is that on account of the limited staffing no choice is given us in this matter.

502. Would you not advocate the employment of a lady teacher for the baby classes?—I should strongly, but a very young lady teacher.

503. You think a young girl would be more likely to take with the children than an elderly lady?—Yes.

504. You said just now that the colonial scale would really involve central administration?—Yes; that was our decision as a local branch of the Institute.

505. *Mr. Davidson.*] How many were present at the meeting?—Ten.

506. *Mr. Weston.*] Did you consider the possibility of political and other influences coming in, either to the prejudice or to the advantage of individual teachers?—It was not considered in detail. I have heard the matter discussed by teachers informally, and generally there is little fear entertained of undue political influence being brought to bear on teachers.

507. Do you seriously think that the central administration would insure teachers in one district securing appointments in another?—I think it would.

508. Would not the district in which an appointment had to be made, or, rather, the local authority administering education in that district, advise the Government to appoint a teacher who was known to them?—I conceive that a very great probability.

509. Then, if there be that probability, where will be the direct advantage of conferring upon the central department the power of appointing teachers?—It makes possible what just now is absolutely impossible.

510. With regard to pupil-teachers, would it be within their power to attend such central training-school as might be established at Wellington?—It should be made compulsory.

511. Would you expect the Government to pay all the expenses, or do you think that the parents of pupil-teachers, speaking generally, would be in a position to send their children to Wellington for instruction?—I think as much has been carried out in other countries successfully. I consider it would be a most wholesome check on an undue number of pupil-teachers.

512. It means that we should go back to class school-teachers—in other words, that the children of poorer parents would be unable to enter into the profession?—By means of scholarships, for which all may compete, that may be made possible.

513. In that case you would require more scholarships than now, and also training-school scholarships?—I should certainly advocate the establishment of training-school scholarships.

514. You said just now that sometimes a pupil-teacher would be in six schools in the course of one year: how comes that?—It is quite unaccountable from a teacher's standpoint.

515. Is it in the power of the Board, when a pupil-teacher is taken into a school, to move that teacher *nolens volens* from school to school in that way?—This Board's regulations are that when any pupil-teacher declines to remove when ordered, his refusal will be followed by summary dismissal.

516. Do you consider that a hard regulation?—I do, very.

517. In the preparation of a colonial scale, I take it that in your opinion we should ignore monitors, and that we should limit the number of pupil-teachers, both on account of their inferior teaching and on account of the sacrifices they have to make in the shape of their own instruction?—That is so.

518. You told us you favoured uniformity of instruction: do you consider that this colony, or any other colony or country, can be benefitted by dead uniformity in the instruction of the rising generation?—Up to a certain limit, I think it is absolutely necessary.

519. What limit is that?—The exit from our public schools. It is there that individual divergencies begin to operate.

520. If the Boards of Education are dispensed with, would the public have any voice whatever in the appointment of teachers?—The local public would and should have very little say concerning appointments.

521. I presume you will admit that the existing system of education has shut up a large number of schools, and that private schools are the exception, and not the rule?—That is so.

522. If there were no system of primary education, would parents not be entitled to select their own schools for their children?—That is so.

523. Seeing they are shut out from private institutions and schools, is it not right that parents should have some voice—and a considerable voice—in the carrying-on of the substituted schools—viz., our own primary schools?—I consider that the present method of allowing parents a voice in the appointment of teachers is the cause of a great deal of discord throughout the colony.

524. There are nearly three thousand teachers in New Zealand?—About that.

525. How many children are there receiving education?—About 130,000.

526. Does it not strike you that in the administration of a department comprising nearly 3,000 teachers and 130,000 children there must be a considerable amount of patronage in the hands of the Government?—Yes.

527. Then, can you, as a man of education and great thought, safely say that in that administration it is not possible that undue influence should exist to the prejudice of some and undue advantage to other teachers?—No system out of Utopia, I take it, would be free from imperfections, but we must be satisfied with the best under the circumstances.

528. How would you advise us to deal with localities where there were perhaps up to, we will say, fifteen children?—I should say that the burden of educating families so remote from centres should really fall upon the heads of those families, and should be included in the sacrifices incurred in their pioneer life.

529. How is primary education supported—from the rates of the people, is it not?—Yes.

530. Who, to a large extent, contribute to those rates indirectly and directly for the interests of the country?—Undoubtedly, the settlers.

531. Why, then, should the settlers who go out into the backwoods as pioneers for the benefit of the country at large be sacrificed in the shape of the education of their children?—Because it is impossible to include in any system such cases as an individual family, or two isolated families.

532. You do not think that special consideration should be shown by the Government of the colony to people so unfortunately yet so honourably and nobly situated?—I should do everything possible to minimise the disadvantages of their position, but from my knowledge of what is called school-training in parts such as you describe I consider it is a shadow instead of a substance. The teacher who will undertake the work is a person who will do more mischief than good.

533. Would not that class even be competent to instruct these unfortunate children in the three Rs?—It is not conferring on them all the benefits of the education system.

534. *Mr. Hogben.*] You expressed the opinion that a colonial scale entails central administration; do you mean central administration of the whole system, including the appointment and dismissal of teachers?—The resolution which I quoted in my statement was that any system of administration would be incomplete unless it conferred upon the department the power to promote, remove, transfer, or dismiss teachers.

535. Do you mean thereby that the colonial scheme fixed by statute necessarily involves central administration—that it could not exist apart from it?—It could exist apart from it, but would not cover the whole ground of the teachers' discontent.

536. Does it mean the appointment and dismissal of teachers?—It does.

537. Do you think that is desirable?—We feel it is very desirable. Whatever evils may emerge under that system, they must necessarily be less than the evils which at present obtain.

538. Do you not think that the circumstances of different schools vary: is it likely that all the schools of 30 pupils will be exactly alike all over the colony?—Sufficiently alike to make it possible to transfer a teacher from a school of 30 in one part of the colony to a school of 30 in another part of the colony.

539. Do you not recognise that there are local conditions which it is very desirable to consider in making appointments?—I think not in primary schools. It might be so in secondary schools; but I cannot conceive differences great enough to create teachers of a different type for a distinctive class of school.

540. Do you not think that local knowledge of the school and local knowledge of the candidate is very desirable on the part of the appointing body?—I think not. I believe it has led to preferences that have been highly hurtful to teachers.

541. Do you not think it would lead to much greater evils if the appointing body had no knowledge of local circumstances, and no knowledge of the candidate?—It is quite easy to conceive evils arising, but, as teachers generally, we do not fear them so much as we do those of the present.

542. I am thinking of the children?—Speaking generally, the last consideration in the selec-

tion of teachers by Committees is the welfare of the children. I believe very little consideration is given to the question whether this or that particular teacher is the best teacher from the point of view of the children's good. I do not believe it is the question at all; it is a question of patronage of a very objectionable form.

543. In your opinion, should there be no local voice in the appointment of teachers at all?—I think there should be no local voice.

544. Do you know the Victorian system?—Only from hearsay; I have not lived under it.

545. Are you aware that there is a great deal of discontent in Victoria?—I have heard recently that it is not satisfactory.

546. The system you urge has not cleared away the evils you complain of in Victoria?—It appears from hearsay that that is so.

547. If full enough powers were conferred on the Boards to appoint and, if necessary, transfer teachers without having to formally consult the Committee, would that do away with the evils you have in your mind?—Yes, it would. If that power came into operation it would meet our views entirely.

548. That would do away with the necessity for centralising?—Yes; but central control was the only way we could conceive it possible.

549. You are in favour of training-colleges?—Yes.

550. If so, you would like these colleges to be open to pupil-teachers and those likely to become teachers, whatever part of the colony they were resident in?—Quite open.

551. In such a case, whatever the method of administration, it would be necessary to provide special scholarships, or, in any case, training-school studentships, to enable them to receive that training?—Yes, to be just to all candidates.

552. So that that expenditure in connection with the training-colleges would have to be a method of administration?—I think so.

553. You say that your Board has a regulation as to the transfer of pupil-teachers: can you point me to that regulation?—It was notified by circular; I do not know that it is laid down in the printed regulations.

554. Do you share the opinion of many teachers in New Zealand that it is desirable to issue alternative syllabuses in this colony?—Outside essential subjects.

555. English composition, for instance?—I think that would be highly undesirable. I think it is essential that the elementary educational equipment of a child should be the same all over the colony.

556. You think that pass-subjects have such a character that there should be no departure from uniformity there?—The individuality of the teacher would give sufficient diversity there, I think.

557. Would not the individuality of the teacher largely affect the method of teaching arithmetic in the early stages?—It should not be allowed to do it to the extent of making any diversity in the result.

558. Yet they allow variety of method in Scotland and England in a very marked manner?—It was not noticeable when I visited the schools of Scotland a few years ago.

559. In the class-subjects, would you allow individuality?—I should allow a certain amount of individuality to operate in that region.

560. Do you not think that in agricultural districts it would be just as well to take the science-teaching from agricultural subjects—subjects which surround the children on every side?—I think it a mistake in the primary schools to attempt to localise and take on the colour of the surroundings more deeply than the children already have them.

561. All the primary course of a child is practically the beginning of his education, is it not?—That is so.

562. Then, in the object-lessons, and in the science lessons, which are extended object-lessons, would you not take the subjects from among those things that the child actually sees around him?—Undoubtedly, but not to confine them to those. All our instruction is proceeding "from the known to the unknown."

563. In that case, would there not be a departure from uniformity of instruction according to the surroundings of the child?—The individuality of the teacher and the local circumstances may operate, but that is not spoiling the uniformity of result.

564. *The Chairman.*] Do you think, if teachers were placed beyond the control of the Board, and were simply under the central department, that the dissatisfaction would disappear?—We are perhaps foolish, but we have hitherto believed that.

565. Is the teacher in any worse position than any other professional man, or tradesman?—Yes, I think so. We are controlled by an irresponsible body of men coming into office and going out of office, with very indefinite powers.

566. Do you think the Committees are irresponsible?—Yes, I think so. We know that unless there is some special grievance the election of Committees in this colony has been reduced to a farcical form.

567. Then, you have come to the conclusion that the people take no interest in education at all?—No. My opinion is that the public mind is disposed to hand over the management of the education system to experts and authorities; they do not wish to control it as it is being done at present.

568. Have you tested the public mind?—It is impossible to test it.

569. How have you formed your conclusions?—I am just judging by the lack of interest evidenced in the election of School Committees and Boards.

570. Why is it that teachers cannot get into other districts to which they wish to transfer themselves?—We do not know why; it cannot be done.

571. Why are teachers so anxious to get under a central authority?—Because there is no latitude allowed them in the matter of promotion, transfer, or removal.

572. Who is standing in their way?—The present Board administration system seems to stand in their way. The Inspector-General himself says that Boards cannot, of their own will, change a teacher unless with the approval of both Committees.

573. If you were servants of the State, do you think you could come forward and express your views in regard to your employers as you have done to-day?—I fancy no such circumstances could arise.

574. You expressed the opinion that female teachers were unsuited for the higher standards?—Yes.

575. That they are incompetent when it comes to anything beyond the Fourth Standard?—With rare exceptions.

576. Have you had any experience of our girls' schools?—Only as a visitor.

577. Do you think the system of education conducted in these schools is defective?—I do, emphatically.

578. You think the girls taught there are not equal to those taught in mixed schools, or to the boys from the boys' schools?—It depends on how much is included in the term "education." They may reach the standard subjects for passing purposes quite as well in one as the other, but the general effect of the school-life will not be so good.

579. In what way?—They are not so amenable to control.

580. If you abolished Education Boards, what would you substitute?—I am afraid that our conception of the future would end with the abolition of Education Boards.

581. Would you substitute anything in their place?—Yes; I should be disposed to establish local governing bodies.

582. What powers would you give them?—Somewhat the powers School Committees have at the present time.

583. Would you grant them funds to administer?—For buildings, emphatically, yes. They know the needs of the districts.

584. Would you give them the cleaning and the internal management of the schools?—Yes.

585. How do you think those Boards or bodies should be elected: would you place them on a broad franchise or restrict them?—I should be disposed at first blush to give them the powers of local bodies. I should confer the control of the schools in the various districts to a body that would be truly representative of those school districts.

586. Do you think that men of standing and education would accept positions on Boards of that kind, Boards of that nature, seeing that they would only have the buildings, the cleaning of windows, and so forth, to look after?—As a matter of fact, the best School Committee is composed of artisans and workmen.

587. Are not most of the present School Committees composed of artisans and workmen?—Not entirely so.

588. Is that not one of the reasons why fault is found with Committees, because they are composed of that class of people?—I think not; any cause of complaint is from the fact that the powers of School Committees are so vaguely defined, and temperament is allowed such free scope. The duties and responsibilities of Committees are very indefinite.

589. You told us that a good many female teachers, when they grow up, are, as a rule, selfish and spend everything they make on themselves, and you gave that as a reason why they should not receive the same salaries as male teachers: do you think that is really the case, that they are so selfish as you appear to think?—They have not the same obligations resting on them outside of their own needs.

590. Do you think they are more selfish in that respect than male teachers?—I do think so. The tendency of women is to become selfish.

591. You think that young women have less regard for the support and maintenance of the members of their families than young men?—I am bound to say from my observation that I think so.

592. Has your observation been extensive or limited?—I cannot answer that question.

593. Have you come into contact with many heartless female teachers who had very little regard for the support of their parents?—I have come into contact with a large number of female teachers, and the impression produced upon my mind, by their conception of their duties, their life duties, is that they readily become self-centred.

594. I want to know the actual facts: have you known cases of lady teachers neglecting those who had a claim upon them—their parents?—I do; and I know cases of lady teachers whose salaries will allow of a considerable saving, and yet who are living in a hand-to-mouth sort of way, through selfish, reckless expenditure.

595. Have you not known male teachers just the same?—Yes; but less strikingly so, and less frequently.

596. Do you mean that those faults are almost entirely confined exclusively to women?—They are more characteristic of women.

597. How so?—If you take any half-dozen male teachers, and the same number of female teachers, and find out how they are applying their earnings, I venture to say that you will find that five out of the six females are practically living entirely for themselves, while five-sixths of the males are contributing to the maintenance of some member of their individual family, or making provision for settling down in life. I do not think I have misjudged in any way, speaking from my own experience, and I think it would be a very great injustice to male teachers to put female teachers on an equal footing as to salaries.

JAMES AITKEN, B.A., Headmaster of the Wanganui Boys' District High School, President of the Wanganui Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Aitken.] In my opinion, the greatest trouble with the majority of teachers in those matters which lie within the scope of the Commission is uncertainty. Men and women of years, experience, and culture, are not certain from one year to another, altogether apart from the efforts they may put forth, that their income will be the same in the same school. Circumstances over which the teachers, at least, and in some cases over which no one can exercise the least control operate to affect prejudicially the teacher's income. Take for example: (*a*) A wet season with bad roads and flooded streams; (*b*) the growing-up of the settlers' families, by which the school is depleted at the top, no new pupils entering the infant department; (*c*) parliamentary retrenchment; (*d*) the use by Education Boards, in districts in which settlement is rapidly proceeding, of the general fund for building purposes. Causes (*a*) and (*b*) open up the whole question of the equity of payments on average attendance. In my opinion, that is not an equitable basis; it contains too much of the element of chance. When, for example, a school is just on the borderline between a higher and a lower scale, a single shower of rain may determine a teacher's salary on the lower scale for three months. Cause (*b*) is one of the most vexing and tantalizing that can well be imagined. A teacher sees his school slipping away from him simply because the younger members of the families which once formed the school are gradually passing out of the standards, while no young children remain to fill their places. It is easy to see that want of money is at the bottom of all these causes. If there were plenty of funds for buildings, salaries, School Committees, &c., the fixing of a basis for disbursements would be a very simple matter. I am sure that the Commissioners have all observed that the unrest and uncertainty which are so painfully evident among teachers of our elementary schools are quite wanting in the case of the colony's secondary school staff. Why so? Because these schools are supported, not by a vote annually thrown on the floor of the House of Representatives for economists to assail and the friends of education to defend, as if it were, perchance, more or less necessary one year than another, but by incomes derived from the colony's broad acres—reserves for secondary education. Harbour Boards, Road Boards, Hospital Boards, Town Boards, Borough, City, and County Councils, all have independent incomes derived from reserves, apart from their statutory power of rating. But Education Boards, intrusted with a national function of the very first importance, have no power to strike a rate and no income from reserves. Some high schools have actually had so much money in hand that they had to invest it on mortgage, while the Education Board next door was reducing teachers' salaries from 5 to 14 per cent. Why should it be necessary to have High School Boards apart from Education Boards when in some instances they are composed of the self-same individuals? I do not advocate the transference of the reserves from the secondary to primary education—although that were not at all unreasonable. What I do contend for is that the reserves should be nationalised and their incomes used for both branches. In this way abundant funds would be available for both primary and secondary education, and the pinching and scraping which has so hampered education in the past will disappear. For the rest, I believe that we shall never have a perfect system of promotion until the teachers are in fact what they are in effect—Civil servants. I understand that the Inspectors would be glad to be so also. With that the teachers have nothing to do, unless Inspectors are made peripatetic; then teachers will cease to carry out the ideas of any one Inspector, and work by the syllabus. It is, I understand, possible that a minimum certificate shall be adopted, and a certificate under that penalised by a lower salary. It would, I think, be better to encourage high certificates by bonuses. There has been so much reduction in the past that it would be kind to go no lower. The first scheme of staffs and salaries for the suggested colonial scale, though certainly capable of improvement, shows what can be done in overcoming difficulties which were once thought insurmountable. Its weak point is the very low salaries proposed to be paid to assistants. I understand that that has been remedied in the alternative scheme. In that scheme the staffing, especially in the large schools, is very liberal. I should like to see some kind of normal-school training for pupil-teachers. When a pupil-teacher takes charge of a country school, after a short pupil-teachership of four years, he becomes stunted and undeveloped, which he would probably not do if he went in for two years' training in a training-college. More inducements must be held out to boys to enter the profession; otherwise none but the poorest intellects will come in. The cadet system, which has much to recommend it, is responsible for the very small number of boys who offer themselves here. Few boys can afford to teach a whole year without pay, at the age of fifteen, more especially when 5s. to 10s. a week can be easily obtained in other fields. Equal pay for the sexes is theoretically right, seeing that as much is expected from a lady-teacher (and usually obtained) as from a man. But it must not be forgotten that a very high percentage of female teachers have only themselves to provide for, whereas a majority of men have others than themselves to provide for, and a man's responsibilities do not cease with his marriage. The dual control of teachers by Boards and School Committees, while a good thing for teachers in some ways, notably in preventing arbitrary dismissals, sometimes operates against teachers. In that way a teacher who has not been successful in any district cannot be shifted to another district without the formality of consultation. Many years ago I advocated the abolition of the dual system, and I am still of the same opinion. If teachers were taken over by the central department it would, I admit, be desirable to retain some form of local government, more than, say, in the appointment of the Postmaster. Committee districts are too small, and their method of election too informal. Education Board districts are too large, and their election is not popular enough. An advisory board or committee, whose district would be the county, borough, or city, and whose election might be conducted by the machinery already provided for by Municipal Acts now in existence, would give local supervision sufficient, and that by a body directly amenable to democratic control. I very strenuously disapprove of the proposal to

disrate the certificates of teachers. Length of service is only an item in the raising of a teacher's classification, as the Commissioners know very well; experience, rather than mere length of time, being the ground of classification by the figure. And I hold that you can no more deprive a teacher of his experience than you can of his culture.

598. *Mr. Stewart.*] Are you in favour of a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes.

599. *Mr. Luke.*] With regard to the secondary and primary reserves, do you mean that you would like to see the primary and secondary reserves merged?—Yes.

600. You would not deprive the secondary schools of their reserves?—No; I would place them all in the hands of the authorities for both parties—both branches.

601. The secondary schools have more valuable reserves than the primary schools, have they not?—Yes.

602. *Mr. Hill.*] Are you aware that the maximum amount the Commission has available to work upon is £3 8s. 9d. a head for the payment of salaries?—I am not aware of that; at the same time, I think the Commission would be quite within their rights and powers in proposing that a larger sum should be set apart for the payment of salaries.

603. You are aware, in regard to the reserves, that there is a great deal more income derived from the primary reserves than the secondary reserves?—Yes.

604. Your point is that the revenue derived from the secondary reserves should be utilised for the pupils in the primary schools as well as for those in the secondary schools?—Yes, that is my point.

605. You would like to see scholarships given in the secondary schools: you think the revenues from the reserves should maintain the scholarship pupils?—That, among other things.

606. Where there are secondary schools established, do you think that primary school pupils, after they have passed the Sixth Standard, should be allowed to go through the secondary schools without having gained scholarships at all?—I should certainly be in favour of that.

607. And, by means of scholarships, go on from the secondary schools to the universities?—Yes, I advocate that; I advocated it years ago—a free course of tuition from the primary schools right to the threshold of the universities.

608. In order to foster the highest education, would you give special grants to teachers in country schools for teaching pupils after they had passed the Sixth Standard, over and above the salaries paid them on average attendance?—I think that should be done.

609. You think that would be beneficial, and place the country children on an equality with the town children in the matter of obtaining higher education?—That is the old Scotch system, and a very good one it is.

610. Would you suggest its adoption in this colony?—Yes.

611. You think it would be beneficial to the children of the colony?—Yes.

612. And place them all on a common basis?—Yes.

613. *Mr. Weston.*] What you really mean is that you would give the whole power which the Boards exercise at the present time over to the General Government?—No, I do not mean that altogether.

614. What powers would you leave to the Boards?—The powers of an advisory body—a board or a committee: the power of consultation with the Government in regard to the appointment of teachers.

615. That means, a consultation having been held and a difference ensuing, the Government would be the supreme power?—Yes.

616. And the whole control would be left in the hands of the Government?—No; because in the event of the advisory body showing good cause the Government should give way to it, and would do so.

617. You advocate the payment of teachers by the Government?—I do not think we shall ever have a proper system of promotion in the profession until the Government takes the matter in hand.

618. You do not think that political influence could be, either directly or indirectly, exercised to the disadvantage of teachers?—Perhaps so, but I think political influence could be eliminated.

619. Will you tell me, in your opinion, how it could be done?—I am told that Sir Henry Parkes once made a remark in Australia that he could not appoint a messenger-boy, as far as he was concerned, as he had made such stringent regulations with regard to political influence.

620. You do not think that a member of the House could have a quiet conversation with the Minister of any department and point out to him the great advantage that might ensue by appointing a particular man with certain qualifications?—Yes, of course, that could be done, I have no doubt.

621. With regard to the matter of the revenue, you stated just now that you thought the revenue from the secondary reserves should be used for both secondary and primary schools: Do you happen to know whether, at the present moment, the reserves for secondary schools are pretty well absorbed by those schools, and that there would be nothing left for the primary schools?—In some districts they have some of their reserve incomes invested on mortgage.

622. Do you know that in North Canterbury the institutions which feed on the revenue of the secondary reserves are very poorly supplied, and that they are with great difficulty carried on in some instances?—I do not know the North Canterbury district well.

623. *The Chairman.*] You think the teachers should be placed on the same footing as Civil servants?—Yes.

J. K. Law, Headmaster, Manaia, representing the Wanganui Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Law: I have been appointed as a representative of the Wanganui Educational Institute to appear before you and give evidence on its behalf, and therefore I am bound to give expression to its views before my own. With regard to a colonial scale of staff and salaries, I think the teachers are, without exception, in favour of such a scale. The recent deductions have led to a feeling of unrest and insecurity—teachers seem to think there is no finality to the deductions they have suffered in every district, and that in a few years time they will be called upon to make further sacrifices. They feel this very keenly, for the reason that the deductions made upon them have been made at a time when, in every other part of the colony, all classes of workers have been unusually prosperous. Teachers think that a colonial scale is fair, on the principle that equal burdens should receive equal pay; that there is no reason why a teacher who is living, let us say, in Westland should receive a very much lower rate of pay than a man who is bearing practically the same burden in Wanganui. We think that with a colonial scale of salaries there must necessarily follow a colonial scale of staffing. There are two proposals submitted to us—numbers one and two. The first proposal would have reduced the salaries of a large number of our teachers, but, at the same time, would have afforded a very fair scale of staffing; and the majority of the teachers, so far as I know from personal conversation with them, were prepared to accept that scale because they felt that it would raise the salaries and staffing of the teachers in less favoured districts. However, the second scale—the revised scale—is very much more acceptable to us, even though it provides a slightly lower scale of staffing. In regard to these scales, I would like to say that we would prefer the salaries under the revised scale and the staffing allowed under the first scale; but since we see that, in your order of reference, you are limited to a capitation grant of £4, on the whole we prefer to accept the revised scale, for the reason that we think that the reduction of salaries, as would be the case under the first scale, would very materially tend to introduce teachers of inferior grade into the profession.

624. *The Chairman.*] You understand that we are limited to a capitation grant of £4?—Yes.

625. But that it is within our power to recommend to the Government an increased grant?—Yes. We think it is very impolitic to lower the salaries of teachers, and thereby introduce an inferior class. We think—the teachers with whom I have conversed—that the staffing granted in schools of from 35 to 200 in attendance is not so liberal as it is in schools with an attendance of 200 and upwards, and that if any increase in the staffing can be made it should lie between those numbers. With regard to the centralisation of the inspectorate, this district has invariably advocated such a measure. We cannot see, if there is to be a colonial scale—if the cry is equal burdens for equal work—why the centralisation of the inspectorate should not follow. We favour the opinion that Inspectors should be periodically removed from one district to another. We favour some more systematic method in regard to the training of our teachers than at present exists. We are of the opinion that the proposed period of pupil-teachership training is too short to give pupil-teachers that training which will enable them to take up the work of assistants with success. We think it should be supplemented by a further period of training either in a training-college or in a model school; or, again, a period of probationership under the headmaster of one of the recognised better class of schools—one of the principal schools. With regard to the appointment and transfer of teachers, I think that the majority of the teachers in this district are of the opinion that the appointment of teachers should lie in the hands of Boards—that is, if the Boards are to continue. We think, however, that there should be some safeguard in placing that power in the hands of Boards. Both schools and teachers should be graded, so that a teacher of a low grade could work to a higher grade, and a teacher in a high grade could not be put into a lower grade without having the right of appeal. We think that it would be a very good thing if the power of transfer of teachers was exercised more freely at the present time. With regard to payments to the staff on the average attendance, we think it is inequitable. The lower the average becomes the heavier the burden placed on the teacher, and we think that some modification should be made whereby a teacher should be paid more in accordance with the work he or she may be called upon to perform. The teachers of this district are opposed to power being given to Inspectors to revise teachers' grades unless the evils of the want of such a power are more clearly shown than at present. We are afraid that possibly the introduction of a colonial scale might lead to the undue multiplication of small schools, because the responsibility in connection with teachers' salaries is taken off the shoulders of the Boards, and we do not believe in this chance of multiplication being given. I might point out one difficulty that struck me in connection with the proposed appointment of an assistant when the average attendance of a school passes 40—and that is, what is to be done with that school when the average falls below 40? Is the assistant teacher to be dismissed, or is the Board to have the power of transferring the assistant to another school? If the Boards have that power, and exercise it, we think that very great damage will result to the educational system, as in the case of pupil-teachers.

626. *Mr. Stewart.*] I understand that you are entirely in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.

627. I understand you to say that one of the main reasons that guided you in favouring a colonial scale was the greater security that would result to the teachers under such a scale?—That is so.

628. I believe that the district in which you are working is a dairying one?—Yes.

629. The question has been raised before the Commission with regard to the effect of the dairying industry on the work of the teachers; can you give the Commission any information on this point?—It renders the work of the teacher much more difficult.

630. Why?—It reduces the average attendance.

631. Anything else?—To my mind it weakens the intellectual energy of the pupils.

632. How?—Through the immense strain put on the pupils to work longer hours than they are physically capable of.

633. We have heard it stated that they go to school tired out before beginning their day's work: is that so?—Yes.

634. What effect does it have on the pupils?—I have not known pupils to fall asleep myself, but other teachers have told me that such is the case.

635. I suppose your Inspectors know the conditions and report on them?—Our former Inspector knew the prevailing conditions very well, and he certainly expected the same grade of work in the north as in the south.

636. Is it within your experience that the average attendance in the north is lower than it is in the south: that is, of this district?—Yes, it is.

637. What is your average?—Last year it was 75 per cent.; during the last four or five years it has risen from 73 per cent. to 77 per cent., and then it was brought down by an epidemic.

638. I understand you to say that, speaking generally, you approve of the alternative scale?—Yes, I do.

639. You heard the evidence of Mr. Grant this morning and this afternoon with regard to teachers in this district wishing to be under the department entirely: do you agree with that evidence?—I do not.

640. Do you think the statements made by Mr. Grant adequately represent the opinions of the members of your Institute?—They may possibly represent the opinions of some of the teachers with whom he has come into contact. I do not think they had placed before them the possible evils that might arise from centralisation. For myself I have always pointed out to the teachers the serious evils which might very easily arise in that case.

641. In the northen centre of your Educational Institute—the centre that meets somewhere about Hawera—are those opinions current?—With regard to centralisation, were teachers graded and schools graded I think that such a desire would not exist.

642. You think that desire does exist at present?—Yes, among a large number of teachers I think it does; I do not say among the majority, but among a large number.

643. I believe you have very frequently been a member of the Council of the Institute?—Yes, about five times.

644. You have been a member of the Council a greater number of times than Mr. Grant, have you not?—I think Mr. Grant has been a member five or six times.

645. You come together sometimes?—Yes, sometimes.

646. Speaking from memory has this question of going under the central department ever been discussed as a practical issue before the Council?—I have no recollection of such a question being discussed at the Council meetings.

647. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider that 50 per cent., which is adopted in computing the working-average, is too low?—Yes.

648. What would you suggest in substitution?—I think that payment on the average school-roll would be more equitable.

649. What percentage of the school-roll would you take, the full school-roll, or, say, 80 per cent.?—I would take the full school-roll, because I believe the average of pupils who leave a school, and whose names remain on the roll six weeks, is very even throughout the district.

650. Did you hear the reply of a former witness who advocated the payment of teachers on the basis of the number present on an examination-day?—That opens the way to too many contingencies. I am not in favour of it; sometimes it occurs that parents have a spite against teachers—after all, human nature is a very small thing—and these parents would undoubtedly keep their children away, and thus affect the salary of a particular teacher for the whole year.

651. You think a colonial scale would have more stability than a scale drawn up as the result of a conference between Education Boards?—Yes, that is my opinion.

652. Are the members of Education Boards elected by members of the School Committees?—Yes.

653. The more a Board pays to the Committees by way of incidentals the less will be left to pay school-teachers: is that so?—Under the present school system it is so. If the Boards make large allowances by way of incidentals to the School Committees it is at the expense of the teachers.

Mr. Lethbridge: I would like to put it in evidence, Mr. Chairman, that the Wanganui Board pays less to School Committees than any other Board in New Zealand.

654. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You consider that there is a possibility under a colonial scale of Education Boards establishing too many small schools?—I am afraid that the fact that the Boards would be no longer responsible for the payment of teachers' salaries would have a tendency in that direction.

655. Do you think that the Legislature should lay down a minimum average attendance below which a school should not be established—say an attendance of 8 or 10, or any other number?—Yes, I think that should be done; and at the same time I think they should lay down a minimum distance within which radius schools should not be established in proximity to one another.

656. With regard to giving marks for efficiency, do you consider that Inspectors should have the right of reducing teachers' certificates—the figure or the letter?—Without very great safeguards indeed I am decidedly opposed to any such proposal.

657. You heard the evidence of Dr. Smyth yesterday?—Yes, I heard a part of it; I am aware he is in favour of such a proposal.

658. *Mr. Hill.*] Would not the increased staffing which is proposed or suggested in the scale submitted to us strengthen the conditions of the schools in this district?—Certain classes of schools—yes.

659. Do you not think it is desirable to strengthen the condition of your schools, to improve them from an educational point of view?—I think it is desirable, if possible, to strengthen the staffing of certain classes of schools.

660. Then, should we not consider that question, irrespective of whether it will affect the money question at all or not?—Most emphatically, yes; but I understand you are bound down to a certain grant *per capita*.

661. Assuming it is found that the staffing in certain schools is insufficient, do you not consider that it is a most important question to contemplate the improvement of that staffing?—Yes, a most important question.

662. You are not satisfied with the present method of paying on the average attendance?—No.

663. Do you think it would be a fairer method to pay on the highest number present at all during a week?—I am not in favour of paying on the average attendance at all.

664. Is it your opinion that a teacher should have a defined salary irrespective of the attendance of the school?—My theory in regard to teachers' salaries is this: that a teacher's salary should depend on length of service, classification, and literary ability, irrespective altogether of the work that teacher may perform.

665. Do you not think a teacher should be paid according to the work he or she may be doing?—Yes, I do.

666. Do you find that your Committee has sufficient funds to provide for keeping your school in good order?—No, we have not sufficient funds.

667. Have you been in any other school in this district?—Yes; in two others.

668. Did you find the same defects existing in both those schools?—In one I did, but not in the other.

669. Do you know whether this scale of the Wanganui Board has been in operation for any length of time, so far as the amounts paid to School Committees are concerned?—Yes; the scale has been in operation for a considerable time.

670. Did you find the scale sufficient for the maintenance of certain schools?—Not for one school.

671. Were entertainments given in that school in order to provide funds for its proper maintenance?—I never have had anything to do with entertainments in order to provide funds for School Committees.

672. How do the Committees obtain sufficient funds?—The particular school I referred to was a school of about 40 pupils. The Committee had a certain method of carrying out the work in connection with that school—the cleaning, &c., which a boy did for about 1s. a week.

673. *Mr. Smith.*] You stated that you thought the establishment of small schools was detrimental to the interests of education, and that you thought small schools should not be established with an attendance below 8 or 10?—Yes, that is so.

674. What would you do in the case of families residing in out-of-the-way places who were unable to assemble together 8 or 10 children: would you grant them no education whatever?—Those people go into these out-of-the-way districts where they can take up cheap land. They do so in order to derive certain advantages, and these advantages must be secured at a cost of something to themselves.

675. Would you not give them any aid?—No.

676. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Do you approve of the system in the Wanganui Education District of giving a capitation grant up to 20 pupils, and asking the settlers to make up the balance to a certain fixed sum?—Yes, I approve of that.

677. *Mr. Weston.*] It is true, as you say, that those people who go out into the far country districts get compensating advantages. We are, however, dealing with the children, and not the parents: do you not think that with our primary system of education we should disregard the parents, and see that every child in the colony is educated?—I think the parents, as a rule, can afford to send their children to some centre to be educated.

678. Why do we appoint Truant Officers: is it not to pick up the waifs and strays, with a view to seeing that every child in the colony is educated?—Yes, that is so.

679. Then, if we employ Truant Officers to pick up the waifs and strays in the towns and suburbs, and to give them education, why should we not render special help to the children, mark you, of parents who from circumstances are unable to give them education?—I think the question is, Do you intend to apply it to a single family?

680. That is what we want you to tell us. What, then, do you think should be done?—I do not think the State can afford them any assistance.

681. Do you not think that some effort should be made to get at every child, and give him the benefits of education?—If it can be done without too great sacrifice.

682. Then, sacrifice becomes a mere matter of degree?—Yes.

683. Do you not think you take a selfish view of the subject?—No, I think not.

684. You do not think the larger centres should make some sacrifice to supply education to the children in out-of-the-way settlements?—No.

685. Why?—Because education to those few is exceedingly costly.

G. H. Espiner, Bunnythorpe, examined.

Mr. Espiner: I have been appointed by the members of the Palmerston North Branch of the Wanganui Educational Institute to represent the teachers of the country schools in that part of the district, and on their behalf must say that the proposed scale of staff and salaries does not commend itself to our favour on the following grounds: (1.) We are of the opinion that the scheme before us does not go to the root of the matter. A colonial scale of staff and salaries should, in our opinion, carry with it opportunities for transfer and promotion throughout the colony, and not be confined, as it practically is at present, to one education district. (2.) The proposed scale makes no definite provision for payment of instruction to pupil-teachers, but leaves it to the option of the various Boards. We think this is most unfair, both to the Boards and the

teachers. Our Board is probably one of the most liberal in the colony, but the mere pittance we receive for this part of our duty is most hardly earned. It amounts to about 1s. per hour, a sum less than what is paid to any ordinary carpenter or blacksmith. But by the proposed scale this sum, small as it is, may be withheld if the Board thinks it expedient to do so. Seeing to what straits many Boards are reduced to find ways and means for carrying out their various functions, what a temptation there must be to take advantage of expediency at the expense of the teacher. We are strongly of the opinion that all money to be paid as salaries should be so well defined and ascertainable that there shall be no possible chance of their being used for any other purpose. According to the proposed scale, a teacher with an average of 74 would receive £173 8s. per annum, and a teacher with an average of 75 would receive £174 per annum, a difference of 12s.; but the latter would be required to give five hours extra per week instructing a pupil-teacher, to say nothing about added responsibility, and this for the munificent sum of 12s. per annum. It may be argued that he gets the assistance of an extra teacher, but it is the State that receives the benefit of the extra teacher's services, not the headmaster. Whenever a school increases sufficiently to require a pupil-teacher there should, in our opinion, be added to the principal teacher's salary a sum sufficient to recompense him for the tuition and training of the said pupil-teacher. (3.) It states in the preface that an endeavour has been made to give such salaries as will attract good teachers, or, at all events, prevent the best teachers from going into other professions. Now, so far as this district is concerned, the proposed scale has a tendency in an entirely opposite direction, for out of 141 sole or principal teachers only twenty are in charge of schools with an average over 100, which by the proposed scale carries a salary of £189 per annum. Where is the inducement for a bright and intelligent youth to enter a profession where less than twenty out of 140 are receiving £200 a year? What a number of years a person must spend in his profession before he can naturally expect to be one of the fortunate twenty. On the other hand, teachers in this district in charge of schools with an average of from 75 to 135 are by the proposed scale to suffer a reduction in their salaries of more than £20 per annum. Yet you will find some of the best teachers in these schools there, simply because there is no room for them higher up. Where is the endeavour to retain them in the profession? (4.) We object to the scheme because schools of 100 are penalised for the benefit of those above and below them. Taking the figures given, we find that at present schools with an average of 20 receive from £70 to £115. The mean is £92 10s.; and it is proposed to give £120, a rise of £27 10s. Schools with an average of 100 receive from £160 to £225; the mean is £192 10s.; and it is proposed to give £189, a decrease of £3 10s. Schools with an average of 250 receive from £203 to £275. The mean is £239; and it is proposed to give £259, a rise of £20. Schools with an average of 600 receive a rise of £9 10s. above the mean. We can understand the force of a reduction in our salaries to benefit a weaker brother, but look upon it as a rank injustice to take from us to enrich those that are already in a better position than we are. Finally, we object to the scheme because it entails some drastic alterations in salaries in this district, reducing some more than 12 per cent. Out of 141 sole or principal teachers, fifty-five would be reduced sums varying from £1 to £25 per annum. The chief sufferers would be the teachers in charge of schools ranging from 75 to 135. In conclusion, I would say that we agree with the arrangement in the proposed scale for appointing an assistant rather than a pupil-teacher when the school is too large for one teacher. I hope the proposed scale will not come into force.

686. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you refer to the original scale or the amended scale?—The original scale.

687. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do the teachers whom you represent favour a colonial scale, or do they still wish the payment of salaries to remain in the hands of Boards?—They are in favour of a colonial scale, but not this proposed colonial scale.

688. I understand they are not in favour of this particular scale we have before us, but are in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.

689. *Mr. Luke.*] You have not studied the alternative scale, I understand?—No, I have not; but from the glance I had of it I think it would be preferable and more acceptable to the teachers than the original scale.

690. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] What is the average attendance of your school?—About 109, I think.

691. What is the allowance paid just now by the Wanganui Board for the instruction of pupil-teachers?—£10.

692. Was that not reduced when the last reduction of teachers' salaries was made?—I think it was still kept in force; the reduction took a different direction altogether.

693. Was it not proposed by the Board to ask the teachers to instruct the pupil-teachers without remuneration?—Yes.

694. Was it owing to the Institute that the proposal was not carried into effect?—I presume so.

695. If the proposed alternative scale was adopted, you and your assistant mistress would considerably benefit, would you not?—Yes.

696. In the event of a colonial scale being drawn up you would not advocate its application, so far as the certificates are concerned, until new appointments were made?—No.

697. With regard to bonuses on certificates, do you favour the continuation of that system?—I think it is a good one.

698. Do you know of any other education district in which it is adopted?—No, I do not.

699. Would you favour the reduction by way of penalty in the event of a teacher not holding the required certificate as in the suggested scale?—No, I do not think so.

700. With regard to the working-average, do you think it is too low?—I think 50 per cent. is too low.

701. How does it affect your school?—Very little.

702. Supposing it were raised to 60 per cent.—that is, two-thirds—would it give you any considerable relief?—Yes, I think it would.

703. Do you think that a head-teacher or sole teacher should suffer a reduction of £10 from his salary when a sewing-mistress is appointed?—No, I do not.

704. Do you consider the remuneration of pupil-teachers is sufficient?—No, I do not.

705. *Mr. Hill.*] When the Inspector visits your school, does he judge the work on the certificate you hold or on the results of your work?—He bases his report on the work of the pupils.

706. I suppose you will admit a man must be judged by the work he can do?—It is difficult to say what a man can do.

707. If he has a school you judge by the results obtained: do you think that is a fair way?—I think a fairer way would be to judge him by his methods of training.

708. You mean the way he trains the children?—Just so.

709. Do you think it is advisable to give a special bonus for literary qualifications when they are necessary for the development of a teacher's technical skill?—Perhaps literary qualifications are not necessary.

710. From what I judge, you are not in favour of a bonus scale as it is in this suggested scale?—I am in favour of that.

711. Yet you recognise that it is apart from the work you do as a teacher?—As a teacher in a primary school, yes.

712. Do you think there is any reason why the bonus should not be the same in the case of a female as in the case of a male when they both hold the same certificate?—Yes; because I think with a man it is his life's work, while, generally speaking, with a woman it is only a small portion of her life's work.

713. Do you not think it would be a woman's life work if she were paid an equal salary?—No, I do not think so.

714. Under certain circumstances is a woman not as competent as a man?—I would not like to say.

715. Could you do without female teachers, say, in your school, for example?—With the exception of the teaching of sewing, yes.

716. Do you think a male teacher equally competent to teach the infants as a female teacher?—I think so.

717. And you would not object to a male teacher taking charge of the infants?—No, I would not.

718. You think the results would be as good as under a mistress?—Yes, provided you get the right class of male teacher.

719. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do I understand you to say that the proposed scale increases the salaries of only a few out of the total number of head-teachers?—Yes, that is so.

720. Does your remark apply also to schools under 20 in attendance?—Yes; their salaries are increased up to 45 in attendance.

721. How many schools of an attendance of 45 have you in this district?—I cannot tell you.

722. Are you aware that out of the total number of schools—143—in this district you have 72 under 35 in average attendance, or a little more than one-half?—Yes.

723. The amended scale would remove your objections by the payment of higher salaries?—Yes.

724. *The Chairman.*] You are acquainted with a good number of teachers in your district?—Yes.

725. What is the general feeling: do they wish to remain under the Boards, or to be under the control of the central department?—So far as I have heard expressions of opinion, they desire to be treated as Civil servants.

726. Is that the feeling prevailing throughout the district?—Yes, so far as I am aware.

727. Assuming the Board paid the teachers higher salaries, granted them retiring-allowances, and also took in hand the payment, transfer, and promotion of teachers, do you think that would give satisfaction?—Yes, I think it would.

728. That would redress all the teachers' grievances?—Yes, so far as they have grievances.

729. Do you think the teachers care very much as to whether they are under the control of the Board or the central department, so long as their salaries are raised, and their position improved by giving them a greater feeling of security?—I do not think they have any fault to find with the Board.

730. Do you think that they would have advantages under the central department that they have not under the Board?—Yes.

A. A. Browne, Secretary of the Wanganui Education Board, examined.

731. *Mr. Hill.*] You have had a long experience as secretary of this Education Board?—Yes; I have had about twenty-four years' experience.

732. What is the proportion at the present time of female teachers to male teachers: have you more male teachers than female teachers?—I could not say offhand.

733. Have you a number of female teachers in the smaller schools?—Yes.

734. Do you find from the Inspectors' reports that they give equal satisfaction to male teachers?—I think so, in the small country schools.

735. Do you find that they obtain certificates during their pupil-teachership?—Yes, some of them do.

736. Are those in charge of country schools certificated?—Yes.

737. Is provision made by your Board that female teachers shall be paid the same salaries as male teachers in those small schools?—No; the female teachers receives 75 per cent. of what is paid male teachers.

738. The Board estimates that women's needs are not equal to those of men?—Yes.

739. Yet they require the women to obtain the same certificate and perform the same work as male teachers?—Yes.

740. What is your opinion as to the salaries that should be paid under such conditions?—I should say that, if funds were available and the female teachers were as capable as male teachers, they should receive equal pay.

741. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Has not a female teacher as much difficulty in obtaining a certificate as a male teacher?—Yes.

742. Then, do you think it is equitable that she should be paid only 75 per cent. of the salary a male teacher receives?—Speaking for myself, I should prefer to see her receive the same salary.

743. *Mr. Hogben.*] Will you furnish the Commission with a return of the expenditure of the Wanganui Education Board for the years 1898, 1899, and 1900?—Yes, I will furnish a return showing what you require.

NAPIER.

THURSDAY, 13TH JUNE, 1901.

Rev. Dr. DAVID SIDEY, Chairman of the Hawke's Bay Education Board, examined.

Dr. Sidey: During the last two years the prospect of a national scale for teachers' salaries has engaged my attention. For some years the Board has had to supplement its expenditure by the drawing on the remains of an accumulated balance from the prosperous times. That balance has gradually been melting away, and must soon have come to an end. When that result was reached we must have recast our scale of payments, and I did not see how that was to be done in a satisfactory way without very considerable difficulty. Hence I looked forward with hope to a national scale as the most probably satisfactory relief. There have been difficulties in connection with it which I did not anticipate. To some extent these have arisen from the ambitious character of the scale itself. It makes great changes on payments to teachers. Some are increased and some are decreased. Under No. 1 colonial scale head-teachers get an increase of £805 in this district, and a new order of teachers is instituted to cost £3,200. There is a decrease of £681 on assistants. Under No. 2 scale head-teachers get an increase of £1,397, new teachers get £2,140, while assistants are reduced £1,043. It seems to me that these increases overweighted the national scale, and that the decreases on assistants are excessive. This Board paid £2 19s. of the capitation of £3 15s. on teachers' salaries, while 16s. went for School Committees, apparatus, repairs, and administration. Latterly the sum has been insufficient, as I have said. Under No. 1 scale, the new scale, £3 8s. 8d. will go for teachers' salaries in this district, and under No. 2 scale about £3 8s. 2d. I understand that under either scale 11s. 3d. will go for allowances to School Committees and administration. If 16s. was insufficient it is difficult to see how the Board can carry on with 4s. 9d. smaller amount on each pupil than was necessary before. Under No. 1 scale new teachers get 9s. 4d. per head, and head-teachers 2s. 4d. Under No. 2 scale new teachers get 6s. 3d., while head-teachers get 4s. 1d.—*i.e.*, 11s. 8d. of the £4 capitation go to the new teachers and head-teachers, and to make that possible the assistant teachers as a class have large reductions made. To me these results do not seem fitted to advance our national system of education. And yet there seems little prospect of being able to carry on our national system without a national scale of salaries. Whether the staffs proposed by the scales are excessive or not I am not prepared to offer any opinion. It requires greater expert knowledge than I possess to express any judgment on this. As Chairman of the Board, I have to ask the Commission to allow Mr. Hill to testify for it. Teachers will doubtless have their own views on this question, but Mr. Hill is the only expert the Board recognises in these matters. Neither do I care about giving any opinion of any very definite character on salaries. This, too, I consider, is work for the expert. Let the salaries be as liberal as the Commission consider the country can afford without inviting attack when the first touch of depression comes on the country. We are not to forget that Parliament once paid £4 capitation in the early history of the present Act, and reduced it to £3 15s. If the service is overburdened the danger of a similar reduction is very great. In my opinion, there should be a maximum payment beyond which there should be no increase, and all the persons employed as teachers should receive a living-wage. The relative value of the salaries of assistants should be carefully adjusted on some general principle to that of the chief teachers in a school. To me the proposals in the new scale fail to carry this out. Take the school of Napier as an illustration: The headmaster will get £410 or £420 per year, as his house-rent is £50 or £60 a year. His first male assistant will get £230, and his second male assistant £160—*i.e.*, the headmaster will get £20 or £30 per year more than these two men will obtain. This seems to me unreasonable, and not fitted to advance the education of the colony. It is much the same with other schools. Or, to make a different comparison, take the head-teacher of one of our medium-sized schools—say, 147 average—and he is to get £217 with residence under the scale No. 1, and £236 with residence under No. 2, while the first assistant of Napier will get £230 in all. Without capable men in our larger schools it will be impossible to keep them going with vigour. Similar inferences can be drawn of many others of the assistants. There should be some principle regulating the relation of salaries to secure satisfaction. Then, the young teachers who must begin at Class 5 suffer too heavily by the application of deductions on

certificates. Quite a number of them in this district lose as much as £8, £9, and £12 a year by being sent to the smaller schools. The reductions made on the older teachers do not seem to me material in view of the advantage to be gained by a spur to culture. The matter of fitting salaries for the various orders of teachers can only be properly determined by experts in the clear view of what the country considers it can afford for public-school instruction. I am chiefly concerned, however, by the bearing of the proposed finance on the work of the Board. As I have already said, our Board will be seriously crippled by the proposal of the new scale unless we receive a very considerable increase to our building grant. In the past we have received for building purposes, school furniture and apparatus very considerable amounts in addition to the building grant, and we have never been able to meet the requirements of the district, either as to buildings, repairs, or apparatus. I am aware there is a hint in the letterpress accompanying the colonial scale of some subsequent provision being made for School Committees. If this comes in addition to the 11s. 3d. assigned for management the Board might manage fairly. Personally, I have the belief that the apparatus for schools and some of the repairs of the grounds should have some connection with the teachers' salaries. This would lead to greater care of the Boards' property. If the whole that is necessary for repairs and apparatus has to come out of the building grant there will be few school-buildings erected in this district. It will not surprise me if the outcome of the present proposals should lead to frequent and perhaps irritating communication to the department by the Boards. I have also to notice that there is no defined provision in either scale for our training-school. In following the journeyings of the Commission, I observe that many Boards press for training-schools in which pupil-teachers could be brought into contact with the best methods of work before they are sent to the schools. Personally, I am in fullest sympathy with this view for both primary- and secondary-school teachers. Some years ago we in this district felt the absolute necessity of something of this kind for our young teachers, and set up with some difficulty what we call our training-school. Its work is very plainly holding out the very highest prospect for the future. On this matter Mr. Hill, our Inspector, will again prove the best person to give you a useful opinion. I may express the hope that the Inspector-General will take this school into his favourable consideration in the matter of provision. Its maintenance even in greater efficiency than it can reach with its present staff is vital to the educational advance of the district. There is one thing more which is likely to cause embarrassment to the Board—viz., the proper maintenance of our Gisborne District High School. It is carried on at present under a special constitution. The Board only pays the capitation that falls to its pupils to the salaries of the teachers. The other funds are provided by the Governors of the Gisborne High School, who have considerable endowments under their charge for secondary education. Beyond the small sum I have referred to, these Governors provide for the salaries of the master and mistress that conduct it, as well as other necessary things. The Governors of the High School had an Act passed by Parliament to enable them to do this, and they have for a number of years borne the large part of the responsibilities of the school. They also erected a very suitable room in the public-school grounds for the High School work. At the present time the School Committee of Gisborne are in correspondence with the Board to ascertain if they can be regarded as a district high school under the new Act. The Board has asked the Gisborne School Committee very carefully to consider whether or not they are prepared to give up the present constitution to obtain the other. The financial provision of the new Act will fall a long way short of the present expenditure, and will introduce other difficulties into the general staff of the school. The Board is likely to have considerable perplexity on this matter, and if it be within the province of the Commission the Board would like to have its advice. Should there be any other things which the Commissioners may wish to have from us, I am quite willing within a certain circle to reply to any questions. We are now well aware of the difficulties with which the Commission has to grapple, and express the hope that you will succeed in developing a scheme which will meet the requirements of the country.

1. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I understand that you would like Mr. Hill to report on a number of these matters to which you refer?—Yes.

2. In some of the other education districts the Inspectors have professed to know nothing at all about the affairs and conditions of teachers: are you aware of that?—I do not think our Mr. Hill would do that.

3. Have you thought out any better method of securing promotions for teachers than the one that obtains at present?—No; it is a difficult question, and I cannot say much upon it.

4. Do you submit all the names of qualified applicants to Committees?—A committee of five go through the names and make strict inquiries as to character and position, and then submit the names we think fit to the School Committee.

5. And you appoint the one the Committee selects?—Always.

6. Have you thought what should be the minimum wage for a male or female teacher beginning with a school with an average attendance of 20?—We have made those schools dependent on the districts in which they may be established. Our lowest-paid salaries are £80 a year. I believe there are two teachers appointed at £60, female teachers—we do not appoint male teachers to schools of an average attendance of 20.

7. What do you think should be the minimum salary paid to a male teacher?—£100.

8. Is that not too low?—There are not many men in schools of that grade in this district.

9. Do you favour a colonial scale?—Yes.

10. Do you think Inspectors should be under the control of the central department?—I do not know that I should answer that question; I have hitherto opposed that on this Board.

11. You think if you lost your Inspector you would lose your guide and philosopher?—Yes.

12. Does the canvassing of Committees obtain here?—Yes.

13. Do you not think that it should be stopped?—Yes, if you are able to do so; I confess it has been completely beyond our imagination to see how it was to be done.

14. Where the roads are good, do you think it is wise to extend the area of compulsory attendance?—Yes; I think that the area should be extended to three miles in place of the two miles as at present, and to save the multiplication of so many small schools.

15. I suppose that you have not many schools within two miles of each other?—There are some, though very few.

16. *Mr. Davidson.*] You are of the opinion that, in order to make our education system a truly national one, we should have a uniform scale of staff and salaries?—I do not think it is possible to make payments on a uniform basis of the same value throughout the colony, though to get things to work well I think that there should be a national scale; what I mean is that money here, for instance, is not of the same value as in Christchurch by a good deal.

17. Do you think that the difference in the cost of living in the various education districts is so great that it should be taken into consideration in a question of this sort?—I do not see any principle by which it could be taken into consideration.

18. *Mr. Stewart.*] I think you spoke of extra amounts which you had placed to the Building Account: would you kindly say where they came from?—From an accumulated balance in our prosperous days; it has been appropriated little by little until now it has nearly all gone.

19. Did it come from the maintenance fund?—Yes; we have only the maintenance and the building fund.

20. Has your Board been in the habit of transferring money from the maintenance to the building fund?—Yes, always.

21. Have you any idea what the total amount would be likely to be?—No; though it is a considerable sum, I know.

22. Do you know to what extent you have done the same thing this year?—I think the secretary could tell you better than I could.

23. Has the question of the legality of such a procedure been raised?—No; and I do not see how it could be raised. The whole of this money was given not for the salaries alone, but to conduct the education system in this district—it was not defined for salaries.

24. You are aware, when Mr. Reeves was Minister of Education, he spoke somewhat emphatically upon such matters?—Yes; but I do not think that enters into this question.

25. What is the practice of your Board in the matter of the payment of salaries to male and female teachers?—Male teachers receive higher salaries than female teachers.

26. Are you in favour of paying them equal salaries?—No; female teachers are not able to manage the upper standards as well as male teachers, though they are all very well in charge of the infants and the First and Second Standards.

27. I presume your remarks with regard to the payment of assistants' salaries were made with regard to the first proposed scale?—In regard to both scales.

28. Do you recognise infant mistresses in this district?—In a few of the larger schools. I do not know we have ever recognised them distinctly as infant mistresses; I think they have been treated as assistants.

29. Have you any special rank on the staff for the infant mistress?—That is a question Mr. Hill would deal more fully with.

30. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You are of opinion that female teachers are not so efficient as male teachers?—Yes.

31. How do you account for the regulation of the Hawke's Bay Board, Regulation No. 6, which says in schools with an average attendance below 80 a mistress is to be preferred?—Because we cannot get a master. Where we prefer a mistress we look at the fact that sewing is to be taught, and a master has to be provided with a sewing-mistress.

32. There is a large preponderance of female teachers in this district?—Yes.

33. Is that accounted for owing to the fact of their being cheaper?—No; it is for the reason that they are the only kind we train here.

34. I understood you to say, in reply to the first question, that Regulation 6 was adopted because you could not afford to pay salaries sufficient to secure male teachers for schools with an average attendance of less than 80?—We have a certain scale opposite each number of pupils, and these scales do not provide sufficient salaries for male teachers.

35. Do not male teachers apply when there is a vacancy?—Not for these schools.

36. Do they apply for schools with an average attendance of 70?—Yes; we send them there.

37. You say you prefer female teachers in schools up to 80 in attendance?—I do not see that matters very much; if we have suitable applicants, whether male or female, they are sent on in these cases.

38. Do you consider that the Legislature should define the functions of School Committees and School Boards respectively, with regard to the appointment of teachers, in order to avoid the conflict that very often takes places?—If you see any way of adjusting that to better purpose, well and good.

39. Do you think the adoption of a colonial scale of staff and salaries would facilitate the promotion of teachers?—Not in the least with us.

40. Is not your system a parochial system?—It is the same as the systems of other Education Boards throughout the colony, all of which are more or less parochial as a matter of necessity.

41. Do you find any complaints from the School Committees with regard to the inadequacy of the allowances made them by your Board?—Such complaints are universal.

42. I suppose your experience is the same as elsewhere—that it is hard to satisfy Committees?—Yes.

43. With regard to the question of truancy, have you a permanent Truant Inspector?—We had, but dismissed him.

44. What procedure do you adopt now?—None at all; we let the teachers do their best.

45. Did you dismiss the Truant Inspector for economical reasons, lack of funds?—No; a little dissatisfaction cropped up amongst the members of the Board through complaints coming from the teachers, and possibly from the Committees, that the money was wasted.

46. How does your system of appointing trainees in the schools work—I mean those who wish to become pupil-teachers?—We have no actual recognition of them, as a Board; it is left to School Committees, though we did recognise them in a sort of way some six or twelve months ago.

47. They get no allowance from the Board?—No.

48. How does your training department work?—It works admirably, though it is only to a large extent experimental.

49. Do you think training-colleges should be established?—Yes.

50. Are you of opinion that there are teachers leaving on account of the inadequacy of payment?—I do not know.

51. Are the teachers satisfied with the payments made to them?—I do not think you can make them satisfied.

52. In some districts the difference between the salaries paid to male and female head-teachers is 25 per cent., and in others 10 per cent.; for instance, it is 25 per cent. in Wanganui, and 10 per cent. in Southland: what do you consider would be a fair differentiation between the salaries of male and female teachers?—You need the opinion of an expert; I do not know.

53. I see you have compared the suggested scale very carefully with the scale that obtains in the Hawke's Bay District: did you find any other anomalies besides those you have pointed out?—Those I pointed out were the general index of the whole.

54. Did you notice in the alternative scale that an assistant was not brought in until the average attendance reaches 41?—Yes, that is soon enough.

55. In the first proposed scale, did you notice that an assistant was brought in when the average attendance reached 36?—Yes.

56. Were you aware that the Inspector-General, when he laid before the Commission the second proposed scale, intended to devote this £4,400 that we received for the purpose of raising the salaries of the assistants to the highest scale that there is in the colony?—I never heard of that before.

57. Would that do away with your contention?—I would like to investigate that before giving an answer.

58. Did you compare the salaries of assistants here with those in North Canterbury and Otago?—Some of our assistants have received salaries higher here than in Otago. But one or two of these cases are due to special circumstances, and these are points that I referred to when I said that if we adjusted a scale of our own we would have great difficulty in doing it.

59. With regard to candidates for positions under this Board, is preference given to those holding the highest certificates?—No; we send on the higher and the lower, provided the men are of sufficient character and skill to teach the school, and the responsibility rests with the Committee.

60. Do you consider your Board has been too liberal in the matter of aided schools?—I think we have acted with great care. There are very few aided schools in the district.

61. Do you consider that there should be some differentiation in the salaries paid to teachers in the different districts according to the cost of living?—I do not see how that could be done.

62. Would you be in favour of superannuation or retiring-allowance to those teachers who have grown old in the service?—I have not thought it out; but in these days of extreme pressure it would be a good thing for the profession and teachers. It should be partly paid for by themselves.

63. I do not suppose you think that the adoption of a colonial scale of salaries would tend to diminish the power of the Education Boards?—I do not see that it would, provided no more was done.

64. Do you not think if Inspectors were placed under the central department it would lead to greater uniformity of inspection and examination?—I doubt it.

65. Are the Inspectors not the experts to whom the Education Boards look for their information with regard to technical points in the administration of the Act?—I do not know what other Boards do, but that is the case with our Board.

66. He is the guide, philosopher, and friend of the Board?—So far as we need them, no further.

67. You consult him with regard to the fitness of teachers?—No.

68. As to the establishment of new schools?—Yes.

69. *Mr. Hill.*] Do I understand you to say that you approve of a colonial scale?—Yes.

70. Have you estimated the probable effect supposing the Government were to increase the capitation by 5s., to be expended by Education Boards on teachers' salaries: would it enable this Board to give such salaries as are suggested in the proposed scale?—I have not made any computations of that kind. I think it would enable us to restore the bonus taken away two years ago.

71. If the department takes over the functions laid down in section 39 of the Act, do you think that will strengthen the powers of the Board?—No.

72. Will it be detrimental to the efficiency of the Board?—I do not see how it would.

73. If it takes away the control of the money, do you think the Boards would lose in strength and power?—The Boards have to fix their scale, and after that the power is out of their hands.

74. It is proposed that a certain amount should be paid in capitation; that a certain sum

should be fixed by Government for salaries, leaving 11s. 3d. for the maintenance of schools to be administered by the Education Boards: if the central department can control the £3 8s. 9d., does it not follow that they could just as easily control the 11s. 3d.?—No. If they did, of course Boards would come to a dead stand.

75. What functions would remain for the Board if you take away the power of regulating the maintenance of schools in the district: would it be beneficial for education in the district?—We would require 4s. 6d. or 5s., in addition to the 11s. 3d., to carry on as now.

76. Even if the capitation was increased to the extent of 5s., it would require that amount to maintain the salaries at present paid?—No. I was referring to the carrying-on of the repairs and apparatus.

77. Supposing the department were to issue regulations to the effect that these moneys had to be provided for out of the building grant?—It could not be done. There would not be three buildings erected in this district in a year.

78. You think it is advisable to take out of the capitation allowance money for the maintenance of the schools?—My own belief is this: that all apparatus ought to be provided by teachers on capitation; it would lead to a great deal more care being taken of it.

79. Do you mean that the teachers should provide this?—I think it ought to come out of the scale.

80. Would it not likely tend to starve the schools under such conditions?—It has not done so in the past.

81. You are aware that the system in the Old Country costs really as much per head for the training of children as in New Zealand?—I expect it costs more in some cases.

82. Then, do you not think it is desirable to increase the capitation allowance?—If the country sees its way to pay the money I have no objection how much it is raised, provided you can pay the money equitably.

83. Would you suggest that something should be taken out of the Hawke's Bay allowance for the benefit of other districts?—No.

84. *Mr. Smith.*] You said that your reserve fund that you had accumulated in years past had been gradually dwindling away: do I understand you to mean that in the event of no colonial scale being set up the Hawke's Bay Board would be compelled shortly to revise their scale of salaries?—We would require to form a new scale of salaries, and to reduce our expenditure in other ways. I am afraid that salaries would have to come down too, but I could not say until I go into it.

85. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Do you think that all the children in your district are being educated?—I think not.

86. Do you think that is a good thing?—No.

87. Do you think your Education Board is doing its duty in leaving these children uneducated?—I must not inculpate my brother members.

88. I take it you would give more aid to country schools?—I do not think I would give any further aid than we give at present. We give a school for 10 children.

89. *Mr. Hogben.*] Can you tell me the average annual amount of the expense of the Board, outside teachers' salaries and allowances, and outside of building expenditure?—Including School Committees' grants, £4,272.

90. The total of the Board's expenditure, exclusive of teachers' salaries and allowances, and inclusive of the cost of training teachers, the inspection, and district high schools, is, you say £4,272. The total of the last three items is £792, which would leave £3,480?—Yes.

91. And the number of children in the district is 6,841?—Yes.

92. That is about 10s. per head for administration?—Yes.

93. You said 16s. just now?—I was taking buildings into consideration.

94. Supposing the question of salaries was kept entirely distinct from the question of buildings, and separate provision is made for the training of teachers, and district high schools are kept distinct, £3,480 would then really be the incidental expenses of the Board: have you calculated what would be payable to the Board on the basis of £250 and 11s. 3d. per head?—Yes; it would leave a balance.

95. Is it not £4,098 that would be payable under the suggested scheme to the Board for its general expenses? Then, the Board would be £618 better off than now in respect to the general expenses?—No; £352 in the one case. The trouble here is that we vote our buildings annually, and the trouble comes in in keeping up repairs.

96. If we are going to solve the question of allowances and expenses of the Board, it is desirable to keep them distinct from the question of buildings altogether?—Some ways it would, and some ways it would not.

97. *The Chairman.*] You say that when you are appointing teachers the Board selects certain candidates and refers the applications to the Committee, and the Committee decide?—Yes.

98. Does that result generally in the appointment of the best applicant?—Not always.

99. Do you think that such a system of appointment, and virtually promotion, is fair to teachers who are working hard to obtain good positions in schools, but who may be sufficiently independent not to canvass or button-hole Committees?—I may say it is not my ideal system.

100. Which do you think the most competent tribunal to make the selection of teachers—the Committees or the Board?—The Board, unquestionably.

101. Do you not think they should hold the power of appointment in their own hands?—The Committees would not agree to it.

102. Apart from the question of salaries altogether, do you not consider that your teachers are labouring under serious grievances?—I doubt they always will be.

103. I mean with regard to the matter of appointment?—I know, and they always will. I do

not think anything is yet conceived or devised that will get rid of grievances—and just grievances.

104. Do you think it is essential to a national system of education that everything should be uniform—teachers' salaries, allowances, and everything else?—No, I do not.

105. In your opinion, is the present system of education in New Zealand a national system?—Yes; just as much as the other would be.

106. If teachers' salaries are fixed by the Legislature, and paid through the central department, will that not do away with the capitation system?—I do not think it is understood that they are to be paid through the central department. The money is to be sent to the Boards, who will pay it.

107. If once the colonial scale is adopted, do you think that the capitation basis will be continued?—I do not know that I could suggest anything better.

108. Do you think that £4 capitation will be sufficient if paid over to the Board?—The Board could then do a great deal better than it is doing now.

109. But if you had a £4 capitation would you be able to make a scale that would be fairly satisfactory?—We would reduce the few salaries, and could elevate the rest.

110. Do you draw any distinction between assistant masters and mistresses: are they differently paid one to another?—They are fairly well paid relatively.

111. Do you think the discontinuance of the bonus has any injurious effect on the teaching of the schools?—I do not think so; I think all the teachers do their duty.

112. In that case the bonus was not necessary?—It was instituted at the beginning of the Board, and it was thought a good thing.

113. Do you think the sweeping-away of Education Boards and Committees would improve the system?—I think it would ruin it.

T. Tanner, Member of the Education Board, examined.

Mr. Tanner: First, I do not think that a colonial system or scale of salaries will prove to be fair and equitable, as circumstances differ in different districts; secondly, I do not think that any reduction should be made in existing salaries, but that the additional grant of 5s. per head capitation-money (amounting to about £27,000) should be applied to increase the salaries of those teachers throughout the colony who are manifestly inadequately paid; third, the £4 a head capitation-money should be given to the Education Boards in the same way as the £3 15s. has been hitherto given, with special instructions that the additional amount be applied as indicated above; fourth, that it would be a mistake for the department to take out of hands of the Boards the payment of salaries, as it might weaken their influence with and control over the teachers, but the department should in every way strengthen the hands of the Boards, and thus increase their interest and control in educational matters.

114. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do I understand you to say that you think that, owing to varying conditions in the different districts of the colony, a satisfactory scale of salaries could not be drawn up?—I do not say that a satisfactory scale could not be drawn up, but it would involve the working-out of a great many questions, pecuniary and otherwise, and the different conditions in different districts would need going into: what would be sufficient in one district would not be sufficient in another.

115. Do you not think that the conditions in any one education district at the present time differ greatly within that district?—There is a difference between the town and the country.

116. There are thirteen different scales of salaries in the colony at the present time: do you know if any one of those thirteen Boards differentiate in any way between the salaries paid to teachers in different parts of their own district?—No.

117. Do you know if the Railway Department, for instance, takes into consideration the different conditions operating in different parts of the colony in the matter of paying their servants?—I am not aware that they do.

118. Or the Post and Telegraph Department?—I do not know.

118A. Or any of the Government Departments?—I am not aware that any Government Department made any difference in that respect.

119. Do you not think that the differences existing within one district are as great as the differences existing between different education districts?—I should not think so.

120. Would it not be in the interests of education if, instead of thirteen different scales of staff and thirteen different scales of salaries, there was a uniform scale of staffs and salaries for the whole of the schools in the colony?—It might be an advantage.

121. Do you think it would be an advantage to have a uniform scale of staff?—Yes, I think it would, for the reason that I think it would facilitate the transfer of teachers from one district to another, where, perhaps, climatic conditions might render it necessary for a teacher to leave a cold district in the south in order to get into a warmer district in the north.

122. Do you not think that a uniform scale of salaries would help in the same direction?—Yes.

123. Suppose a man, for instance, in Otago, wished, for reasons of health—a teacher holding a certain position—to get to Hawke's Bay or Auckland, as you say, if he is paid a larger salary in a certain district than he would receive for a similar position in another district, would he not hesitate to take the position, seeing that by doing so his salary would decrease?—Yes; but where the payments are *per capita* I do not suppose it would occur. The payment is everywhere on the average attendance, and if the average attendance of a school here is the same as a school in Christchurch I assume the salary would be the same.

124. Yes, under a colonial scale of salary; but you object to the scale of salary, do you not?—I understood it was the same now.

125. No; are you aware there are thirteen different scales of salary in the colony?—No; I was not aware of it.

126. Do you think it is in the interests of education that such inequalities should exist between the salaries paid to men and women doing similar work, but working in different districts?—I think that the payments on average attendance should be the same throughout the colony, and that there should not be a pecuniary inducement for a teacher in a different part of the country to throw up his engagement if there was a chance of getting a higher salary. Of course, if there was an appointment in a school with a larger attendance, and a teacher could get a higher salary through securing that school, I think that would be perfectly justifiable.

127. You think it unfair that men in some districts should receive as much as £50 per annum less than fellow-teachers holding similar positions in other districts, and endowed with the same qualifications?—Yes, *cæteris paribus*, if the cost of living is the same in both districts; that should be taken into account.

128. Seeing that no tone of the Education Boards, or any of the Government departments, take that question into account, do you not think that, in attempting to frame a colonial scale of salaries, it would be better to set that question on one side?—I think salaries should all be based on the average attendance, and let that be universal.

129. Do you not think a uniform scale of salaries would be better than thirteen different ones, as at present?—Yes, I think so.

130. *Mr. Stewart.*] In reply to Mr. Davidson, you said you thought there should be a uniform scale of salaries for the teachers of the colony: would you indicate how you think that could be done; do you think it could be done by leaving the matter entirely in the hands of Boards?—If the amount of money granted to each Board is on the average attendance of that educational district, they would have to divide their salary on the scale which ought to do equal justice to all parties.

131. The crux of the question is: who is to draw up the scale? If the Wellington Board drew up one, and the Hawke's Bay Board drew up another, who is to decide which is the best, and to define the salaries?—I suppose this Commission.

132. That would be practically a colonial scale?—Yes, practically it would be a colonial scale.

133. When you stated in your evidence in chief that you did not believe a colonial scale would work, was it not under a misapprehension as to what a colonial scale really was?—It was a misapprehension I was under as to the different conditions operating in different parts of the colony—I had no particulars of them.

134. *Mr. Luke.*] Have you studied the two scales placed before the Commission?—I have not studied them. I have read them carefully, and puzzled over them. I have not been able to understand them.

135. You quite understand they are not meant as a colonial scale?—I understood from a suggestion that there were reductions in some cases and additions in others. I could not understand these at all.

136. Do you not think, in order to keep up a national system of education in this colony, it is necessary to have a national system of staffing the schools, and also a national scale of payment to the teachers; that a teacher in Auckland should be paid the same as a teacher in Dunedin; that there should not be such a vast difference as there is now?—Yes, I think there should be that system.

137. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to the anomalies that exist—and we know it as a fact that they do exist, because we have thirteen different scales of salaries before us that exist in the various districts—do you think the additional grant of 5s. would in any way tend to remove those anomalies?—Yes, manifestly, as it would tend to enable Boards to increase salaries all round. However, I should not increase the salaries of the higher paid masters. I would not suggest an increase to any salary over £400, and I think the increases should be on salaries under £200 down to £100.

138. Who is to make the increases or the decreases?—The Education Boards. Say, increases of 7 per cent. for some, 10 per cent. for others, and 15 per cent. for others again, in order to remove inequalities.

139. But would we have any guarantee, if the power was left in the hands of the Boards, that they would do so?—No; but the money could be paid to Boards—the £4 capitation—with special instructions that teachers inadequately paid should receive an increase in salary.

140. Last session it was decided to give an extra capitation: that brought the grant up to £4 per head?—Yes.

141. It was proposed by the department to allocate it in a certain direction—say, on the basis of the scale we have before us—and a great deal of dissatisfaction cropped up between the department and the Boards. The Boards wanted to have matters their own way, did they not?—Yes; I think the Boards should not have it in their own hands, but under certain instructions from the department.

142. Will not the Government cease to pay on the capitation grant of £3 15s. or £4, and pay on the scale, and each Board will get its allowance *per capita* according to the scale, and not on the basis of the £3 15s. or £4?—I do not quite understand what you mean by the scale.

143. Supposing, for example, we adopt a colonial scale which, in the first place, says that each teacher doing similar wark, no matter what part of the colony that teacher is in, shall receive a similar salary, what is your opinion?—The inequalities would come in which I thought first of in regard to the cost of living in the different districts. I think, on a further consideration of the matter, the inequalities in the cost of living in different districts would not be of such importance, as it would make the teachers feel that they were being paid relatively the same salaries, and that they were in as good a position financially; also, in regard to staff, in one part of the colony as in another, that they would not wish to move from one part of the colony to another on those grounds.

144. Do you find that there is a feeling on the part of the teachers in this district to favour such a colonial scale?—I have not heard from the teachers any expression of opinion that would warrant me in saying they are in favour of it. If it will have the effect of reducing the salaries of some of the teachers, you will find they will not be in favour of it. I am opposed to any reduction of salaries at all. I think the additional money provided by the increased capitation grant, about £27,000, would be well expended in increasing the salaries of those teachers who at the present time are inadequately paid, and that you would still have a colonial system.

145. I understand you favour giving the extra grant of 5s. to Education Boards and allowing them to draw up their own scales?—Yes, entirely to help those who are inadequately paid now, because some of the teachers are not paid salaries sufficient to live upon.

146. You realise the difficulty of drawing up a colonial scale that will not prejudicially affect one teacher or another, because there are thirteen Education Boards and thirteen scales of payment?—Yes, I did not know that the difference between the thirteen scales was so great; I thought payments were on a more general scale.

147. You heard the evidence of the Chairman of the Board, that if something was not done before long, the teachers in the Hawke's Bay district would have to suffer another reduction on account of the financial position of the Board?—I think that is merely an expression of opinion, emanating from over-caution on his part.

148. Did you not go in for reduction previously?—I am not aware that we have altered our scale ever since I have been a member of the Board. The only reduction I remember was the capitation grant being reduced from £4 to £3 15s.

149. Did you not abolish bonuses?—Yes.

150. How long ago?—Last year.

151. What was the highest bonus paid to any one teacher?—I think £10, though £20 might have been paid.

152. Were not some teachers paid £30?—I am not aware that any teachers were; they may have been, but I do not think so.

153. If a teacher said he was paid £30 I suppose you would not deny that such was the case?—Certainly not.

154. If a teacher receiving £20 or £30 as a bonus was reduced that amount, would it not be a considerable hardship to that teacher?—Of course, the bonus was for extra work—teaching after hours—and as such was extra pay.

155. Do you think that the schools are not so efficiently managed and the children so well taught since those reductions have taken place?—I would not say that at all.

156. *Mr. Hill.*] You understand that education districts to-day pay their teachers in their own way?—Yes.

157. Each district has a plan of its own—are you aware of that fact?—No, I really never entered into that question.

158. Are you not aware that each district formulates a scale of payment by which to pay its teachers?—No; I confess I thought it was a general scheme that all payments were divided by Education Boards in a similar way to our own.

159. In reality you imagined that it was a colonial scale on which the teachers were paid?—Yes, I did.

160. Are you aware how much capitation is paid to the various Education Boards on account of average attendance?—About £400,000.

161. I mean the capitation that is paid on each child?—£3 15s.

162. Are you aware that the salaries paid in the Hawke's Bay District to-day are based on the £3 15s. capitation grant?—Yes.

163. Are you aware that the capitation grant under the proposed scale is £4?—Yes.

164. Suppose this extra 5s. was paid to the Hawke's Bay Education Board, have you taken the trouble to discover whether the Board would be able to pay the salaries of teachers equal to those set forth in the suggested colonial scale?—Yes.

165. Do you think the Board could pay such salaries?—Yes.

166. Do you think the Board could maintain a staff of teachers equal to what is proposed in the colonial scale?—I am not sufficiently acquainted with the staffing under the colonial scale to answer your question.

167. Are you agreed that the standard system of education is the best that it is possible for the colony to adopt?—Yes.

168. Do you think throughout the colony the same work should be required in town and country alike?—Yes, I believe in a general standard for the colony.

169. Would you give technical education in the country as in the town?—Yes.

170. You believe in uniformity?—Yes; I see difficulties in a differentiated system.

171. You believe in uniformity in staffing the schools and educating the children for their life's work?—Yes.

172. Do you think that there are not cases in which a school having the same number of pupils might not need exactly the same kind of staffing?—No.

173. You believe in the payment of teachers on the average attendance, on the proposed capitation of £4?—Yes.

174. Suppose a colonial scale was adopted, do you think a central department, if it had the appointment of teachers, would know better how to staff, we will say, the Napier School than the Hawke's Bay Education Board?—If the department knew its business, it certainly should.

175. Might there not be local circumstances and conditions that necessitate a certain staff in order to meet those conditions in that district?—Possibly. I say that the department should take such matters into consideration.

176. Do you think that the functions of Education Boards would be thus limited?—I do not, as long as Education Boards have the payment of salaries as now.

177. You think that a colonial scale is advisable?—As I mentioned before, I think there should be an equality to that extent—that payments should be on the average attendance.

178. You think that is preferable to an increase to Education Boards of 5s. *per capita?*—Yes; I think there is something in what one of the Commissioners mentioned to me: that if the 5s. was given to Education Boards without any definite instructions the Boards might apply it, if they chose, to increase salaries already sufficiently high, and not assist those salaries that really needed it most. To prevent any danger of that, I think instructions to the Boards should be definite and imperative.

179. Suppose the 5s. was given for the express purpose of increasing teachers' salaries all round in such a manner as Boards might deem best, what then?—I think that the same difficulty would come in—some Boards might not act judiciously—they might increase the salaries that did not need any increase.

180. You think a uniform scale of payment throughout the colony would be preferable to payments to the various Education Boards, assuming that definite instructions were given in the matter?—Yes, conditionally.

181. Assume conditionally that it was spent on teachers' salaries?—If the money was spent on teachers' salaries by increasing those that were inadequate, it would be quite right.

182. If there was a regulation to say that all capitation money must be expended solely on the payment of teachers' salaries, and for no other purpose, would you suggest that there should be a local scale or an Education Board system?—If the regulation bears out that the money shall be expended in building up all salaries below, say, £250, I think that would do.

183. Do you think that the present plan of appointing teachers in the colony is satisfactory?—I do not know.

184. Do you approve of the plan of consulting School Committees in the appointment of teachers?—I do.

185. You think that plan should be maintained?—Yes.

186. Do you think that Education Boards should have the right of removing teachers from one district to another if found desirable—informing the Committees of the fact, but taking no notice of any objection they might raise?—I think the Boards should have that power, but at the same time I think they should consult the Committees.

187. *Mr. Weston.*] With regard to incidental allowance, do you find the amount Dr. Sidey stated you received sufficient for Committees' wants?—Yes, I think our Committees are satisfied—so far as Committees can be satisfied—with the allowance Boards make them.

188. You do not think the incidental allowance should be increased?—I do not say that it should not be increased; where it is necessary I think it would be a very good thing if the Boards had the power to increase the allowance, but it seems they have not the means.

189. As a matter of fact, do the Committees ask your Board for an additional allowance?—Yes; they often do.

190. Therefore, I suppose, you assume they have not enough to meet their wants?—No, I would not assume that, because they try to get the Boards to do little things for them. If the Board has not the funds they do it themselves. I think the parents of the children should help the Committees.

191. Dr. Sidey stated the incidental allowance amounted to about 16s. per head; I presume you desire that the allowance should be maintained and not reduced?—Yes; if possible.

192. I suppose you consider that the incidental allowance at present paid by the Board, amounting to 16s. per head, should be maintained, and that the teachers should receive fair salaries, whether the capitation grant exceeds the £4 or not?—Yes, decidedly; but I thought the £4 grant was a fixed one.

193. Supposing, for instance, that the Parliament of New Zealand should be prepared to vote a sum sufficient to pay teachers fair salaries, and to pay Committees a fair incidental allowance, do you think the Boards could administer the affairs of the institution as well as the Colonial Government?—Yes, I think so.

194. And therefore, perhaps, a colonial scale might not be absolutely necessary?—Yes, if you could insure all the Boards doing equal justice to their staff; I see now, without a colonial scale, it would be very difficult to do that.

195. So far as your Board is concerned, until the last reduction was made—the bonuses were removed—your teachers were satisfied with the Board's administration?—Yes.

196. If your teachers were satisfied, and would continue to be satisfied with the administration of your Board, if their salaries were increased to the old rate, why do you think the administration of other Boards would not be equally satisfactory?—I do not think it would not be satisfactory.

197. Then, do you not think a colonial scale would be really unnecessary?—No; because there is no guarantee from the other Boards that they will not make a differentiation.

198. Is not your district a very large one, running three or four hundred miles along the coast?—Yes.

199. Do you think one Inspector is enough for your district?—Hardly enough.

200. You would advocate the appointment of another?—No, an assistant; I should not advocate the appointment of a full Inspector. We are fortunate in having an Inspector in this district of unusual vigour and industry, who does a great deal of work; he works night and day, and more than a man can be reasonably expected to do.

201. I suppose it would follow that if Providence, in its wisdom, thought fit to take Mr. Hill to a better world, you might require two Inspectors?—Yes, we might. He often does two men's work.

202. From your experience here, do you think the Inspectors should remain in the service of Boards, or should they be under the control of the Central Government?—I think they are better under the control of the Boards. I think the Boards feel that Inspectors are practically a part of them, as it were, and that they can refer any questions of difficulty to the Inspectors. If Inspectors were outside the control of the Board they might think they were so far separated from the Boards as not to interest themselves in matters affecting the welfare of their districts; as, for instance, the transfer of a teacher from one district to another, or an application to open a new school in any district. In such a matter as that we immediately appeal to the Inspector of the district, for the reason that he knows so well the district, the people, and the requirements of the locality where a school is required. I look on the Inspector as a member of the Board, and we treat him as such, and we are only too glad to get his opinion, and the benefit of his information on points we would find great difficulty in deciding.

203. What is your opinion in regard to the abolition of the Boards and Committees, and leaving the control of your school in the hands of the department in Wellington?—I think that would be a fatal blow to education in this country.

204. Why?—Because it would be impossible to have the proper control under the department that we have now under the Boards and Committees over the education system. Committees are elected, in most cases, from the parents of the children who are receiving instruction, and it would be almost impossible for the central department to look after their interests in the same manner as is doen by Committees and Boards.

205. Would it not be possible, in some instances, that an Inspector might say that, although the attendance of a school might warrant, through numbers, an assistant, it is not advisable to put in one; or might he not say that, although the circumstances of the school are such that although there are two or three below the number in attendance at which an assistant is given, or proposed to be given, it is advisable to give an assistant? Would you respect the Inspector's opinion in a case of that sort?—Yes.

206. Then, if your Inspector should be a local man, and if you think he should advise you to make allowances in considering the circumstances of the district, and so on—departing occasionally from the scale of staffing laid down—would it not be better to leave the whole matter of the staffing to the Boards, rather than to the Department of Education in Wellington?—I do not think the few circumstances that would arise would destroy the uniformity of the staffing.

207. You are acquainted with the pupil-teacher system?—Yes.

208. Do you think that pupil-teachers should devote the whole of their day to instructing children, or do you think their time should be divided—partly in instruction and partly in study?—Yes; I think that is the case.

209. Do you think pupil-teachers are competent to impart instruction in schools without the practical supervision of an adult teacher?—I think pupil-teachers ought to have the direct supervision of an adult teacher.

210. Do you think that pupil-teachers trained in Hawke's Bay, we will say, will be qualified to stand side by side and compete with pupil-teachers who have been educated and trained in the training-schools of Otago and North Canterbury?—I do not know anything about the training-schools you mention. I think it is a great advantage to them to be able to pass through the training-schools here.

211. What is your opinion in regard to teaching the sexes together in schools: Do you think boys and girls should be taught together, or should they be taught separately?—I think they should be taught separately. I think girls have their own peculiar traits of character, taste, and feelings; and those best qualified to teach them are members of their own sex. I think the same thing applies in the case of boys.

212. You do not think that in our schools the company of boys would tend to remove all the little idiosyncrasies that girls and young women are apt to acquire, and that the girls would—I will not say exactly civilise—naturally improve the boys?—I think the improvement is general on both sides outside the school, where the boys move with their sisters and relatives. In the schools I say it is a mere matter of study: the boys sit by themselves, and the girls sit by themselves.

213. Do you pay your teachers when they are absent through illness?—They are allowed a certain leave of absence on full pay.

214. For what length of time?—For three months, and they have to get a substitute approved by the Board.

215. At their own expense?—No, not for a certain time.

216. What time?—I think for three months. If after that time they want further leave, the substitute is provided at their own expense.

217. On the death of a teacher do you make any compassionate allowance to his relatives, and, if so, how much?—I am not aware we do.

218. Do you think, under such circumstances as I have mentioned, that a compassionate allowance should be granted?—In some cases I think it should be given; not in all. I do not think the Boards would have the means of paying compassionate allowance.

219. In what cases do you think an allowance should be paid?—In a case of very long service under the Board.

220. Do you think there should be any distinction in the payment of male and female pupil-teachers?—I think, as a rule, that men are put to the greatest expense. A male teacher may marry, and then he has the expense of a wife and family to consider.

221. What percentage of difference do you think there should be in the salaries of a lady teacher and a male teacher?—From 5 per cent. to 10 per cent.

222. Do you think that difference is sufficient?—Yes.

223. In these districts there are, of course, a number—and there must necessarily be—of

isolated settlers, especially in new districts: will you tell me what you think we should advise the Government to do in respect to the children of those settlers and their education?—When there are a certain number of children, say ten in number, the Board gives a grant in aid; the parents assist in order to bring the salary of the teacher up to a sufficiently high level to enable the teacher to live, not less than £80; the Board might pay £40 and the settlers another £40, and also find a house for the teacher to live in.

224. Do you not think that such a system practically amounts to taxing the pioneers?—Unless you have a limit, what is to prevent a family in a bush district, a family of four children, demanding that a teacher should be sent there?

225. Would you or would you not advocate the Board allowing the parents of two, three, or four children the capitation grant, upon a guarantee from the parents that the children composing the family would be educated?—Yes, but I think that would be of very little value, for they would not be able to get a teacher for the amount. The capitation grant of £4 per head on the four children would be £16—quite insufficient for a teacher.

226. Supposing they were able to make some arrangements whereby the children would be taught, do you think they—the parents—should receive the capitation allowance?—Yes; that would be on the same principle as a grant in aid.

227. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you not think that Boards, with their knowledge of local affairs, could manage the affairs of their own department better than a central authority?—Yes, decidedly, in regard to appointments.

228. Do you think that the teachers here would be content to see their salaries decreased in order to build up salaries in districts where the small schools had been unduly increased?—If it could be shown that the teachers in this district were too highly paid, that might be so; but I have not thought that they were.

229. You want all salaries built up to the standard of the wage paid in this district?—Yes; I do not think that the teachers here are paid too much.

230. Reference has been made to the highly paid salaries in Otago: do you think those salaries are too high?—No, I do not.

231. So that if the capitation grant of £4 set down in the proposed scheme is not sufficient to bring up the salaries all round to the salaries obtaining in your district and in Otago, you think it would be advisable for the Government to increase that grant?—I did not understand that the grant would not be sufficient; if the grant is given on average attendance, it should be sufficient in one district as in another.

232. No; for the reason that there are so many small schools in some districts: do you understand that?—Yes, I see now; the larger schools are the sources of revenue.

233. Then, if the grant of £4 is not sufficient, would you favour an increase of that grant?—Of course it is an immense tax on the country, but as the country is launched on the system of giving free education, the country should be prepared to bear that cost, no matter what it may be.

234. You think that there should be a difference of 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. in the salaries paid to male and female teachers?—Yes.

235. Under a scale of staff and salaries, if in a school taught by a lady teacher, would you think it right that under the contemplated scale she should be removed: do you not think that, if anything is done at all, we should so frame our methods that a woman in that position should not lose her appointment?—I do not see how she would disappear.

236. If anything is adopted, should it not provide that a woman in her position should retain a school of that class—a school of about 80 pupils?—I do not see how she could be dispensed with under the new system.

237. If she required an assistant, who had to be a male, you think that female teacher should be retained?—Yes.

238. If the report of that lady's work was good?—Yes; if the Inspector reports that her work is good, she should be paid adequately for that work.

239. The next point is, would you not pay her as good a salary as if a man went into the school?—Yes, I think if she had entire control of the school, she should get the same salary as the man.

240. Are the members of the Committees good representative men of the localities?—As a rule, I think so; I think the people elect those parents who consider the interests of education as of the first importance.

241. We had evidence from an ex-clerical gentleman that the first consideration of parents in electing committeemen was not the proper education of the children, but rather the selection of a lady who could teach the pianoforte, or who was possessed of other social advantages; are your Committees like that?—No, I think our Committees have more sense.

242. You think that they consider educational affairs of the first importance?—Yes, I have always given them that credit.

243. *Mr. Hogben.*] When you say that the smaller schools—most of the smaller schools up to 60 in average attendance—do not really pay, you mean it in the sense that they are unable to meet the expenses of salaries and administration out of the capitation grant of £3 15s.?—Yes.

244. If you raised the salaries all round, or at all events if you raised the salaries of the lower paid teachers, could the expenses be met out of a capitation grant of £4?—I do not say that they could not be met; I think, with proper economy, they could.

245. If we take the proposed salary of a school of 30 pupils, that would be £140, the salary proposed for a master: the capitation on 30 pupils would be £120: that is, without the incidental expenses, it would be £20 short, would it not?—Yes.

246. If, as in this district, and especially Auckland, Wanganui, Taranaki, Marlborough, Westland, South Canterbury, and Southland, the proportion of small schools to large schools is greater

than in other districts, they will obviously have greater difficulty in paying salaries—not only in the small schools, but also in the larger schools—as high as in the better salaried districts, would they not?—Yes.

247. Take, for the sake of example, Taranaki, under the proposed scale: Assuming that the figures I give you are right, the amount for salaries would be £12,809, and for the general expenses of the Board £2,120, making a total of £14,929: the capitation grant at £4 a head would be £13,296, so that the Taranaki Education Board would be unable, by the amount of £1,633, to pay such salaries as are proposed under the colonial scheme within a £4 capitation basis for the whole of the colony, would it not?—Yes.

248. In a similar manner the Wanganui district would be deficient to the extent of £1,610; Marlborough, £1,204; Nelson, £2,497; Grey, £351; Westland, £719; Auckland, £1,156; South Canterbury, £1,007; and Southland, £2,164?—Yes.

Mr. Hill: I would like to ask the Inspector-General what would be the deficiency of the Hawke's Bay district.

Mr. Hogben: Hawke's Bay would not have any deficiency.

249. *Mr. Hogben.*] The extra capitation grant of 5s. would be sufficient for Hawke's Bay, I think, but not for the districts I have mentioned. If the proposal were to give an increased salary all over the colony, without placing the Boards in a worse financial position than at present, and without interfering with their prerogatives, would you approve of that proposal?—In the districts where the grant of £4 is not sufficient, I think that there should be an additional grant in order to make a sufficiency, and to equalise.

250. If you gave the 5s. to some of the larger districts they would have an excess above what is necessary to pay teachers, doing exactly the same work as in other parts of New Zealand, the same salaries?—Yes; I understand.

251. Then the only way in which to pay equal salaries, and to give equal facilities to Boards for meeting their own expenses is by some scale that is in proportion to the number of schools in a district and to the several classes of schools; you agree with that?—Yes.

252. That really means a colonial scale, does it not?—Yes.

253. Then, provided that none of the teachers suffer, and that no Board is placed in a worse financial position than at present, you see no objection to it?—No; that is so.

254. I am assuming that all questions relating to the appointment, dismissal, and control of teachers should be in the hands of Boards. I hold that opinion very strongly, and you do also?—Yes.

255. *The Chairman.*] You said that you considered the circumstances of living in the different districts varied a good deal?—Yes.

256. I suppose you mean by that that house-rent and commodities involved in the cost of living differed very much in one part of the colony from another?—Yes, that is so.

257. And under those circumstances you think a uniform scale of salaries would scarcely give satisfaction?—Yes, that is so; but at the same time I admit that it would be difficult for the department to differentiate with regard to salaries.

258. That is if the question of the payment of salaries is vested in the department?—Yes.

259. Do you think that Education Boards are not animated with a wish to do the best for the teachers, as for the School Committees?—I think they are animated with a wish to do the best possible; I am sure that they should be.

260. Is it in their interests to be otherwise than fair and just to the teachers of the districts?—I should imagine it is not.

261. That being the case, then, do you think that they should not be intrusted with the management of the funds that are set apart by the State for educational purposes—I mean the money for salaries, incidental allowances, maintenance of their staff?—I think it would be safer to have a general direction on matters such as those.

262. You think it would be well, from a financial aspect of the case, that those powers of Education Boards should be controlled by a central department?—I think so, on some general scheme; I do not wish any one Board to get a larger amount than another Board.

263. Do you think that in the past your Board has mismanaged the funds placed at its disposal?—No, I do not.

264. Have you any knowledge of anything such as that going on elsewhere?—No, I have only taken an interest in the district I have lived in.

265. If you are not able to say that funds have been mismanaged, how can you come to a conclusion that it would be better to have the management of the funds taken out of the hands of the Boards?—I do not say that; I say the Boards should have the management of the funds, but under certain regulations.

266. You would place the Boards under regulations?—Yes.

267. If by placing them under regulations you do away in effect with the capitation system, do you think that would result in an improvement?—I do not understand that it would do away with the capitation system; the amounts that would go to the Boards would be based on the average attendance, and Boards would have the distribution of it under certain regulations—outside of the question of the building grant.

268. Have you considered that, in the event of a scale of salaries being once adopted, it will be competent for the Legislature, in conjunction with the department, to alter that scale from time to time—every year when Parliament assembles?—Yes, I suppose so; it would not be like the laws of the Medes and Persians.

269. Supposing that an alteration was made—that it was found that the scale was working admirably, say, in Auckland, and very badly in your district—what do you think would happen?—

I think that the first thing to inquire into would be why, if it acted well in one district, it did not do so in another. There should be some reason shown.

270. There are thirteen educational districts in New Zealand: do you think it is possible to devise a scale of staff and salaries that will give satisfaction throughout the colony?—I do not know that a scale would give satisfaction; if it would do so, I think it would be fair to all districts that there should be a scale.

271. You think that regulations applying generally to the whole of the schools in the colony will be more satisfactory than simply the regulations of each Board?—The Government should give the money under some system, and the Boards would have to do the best under the circumstances.

272. If the power is taken from the Boards—the power of adjusting salaries within their own districts—would it detract from the prestige of the Boards?—No.

273. Do you think the body which appoints the teachers, transfers them, and promotes them, should also have imposed upon it the power of seeing how they are paid?—No; I think the teachers should know how they would be paid, and should not be at the caprice of any Board.

274. Do you think Boards are apt to be more capricious than the General Government?—Yes, no doubt.

275. What should make them more capricious; and why should they treat the teachers badly?—I do not say they would treat the teachers badly.

276. That is what it amounts to—you say Boards are capricious: is that opinion gained as the result of the working of the Board in Napier?—No; it is the result of my hearing there are so many different systems in the colony.

277. But is that not only hearsay?—I understand it is a fact, nevertheless; this is the point: the scales of the Boards are always subject to alteration on the part of the Boards, so that the teachers, one may say, never knew where they are. If a fixed system is laid down, every teacher would know his or her position; for instance, a master, we will say, may be a very agreeable man, and his Board may take a great interest in him, while another master, equally capable, may not be so fascinating, and, perhaps, will not get the recognition from the Board his merits deserve.

278. Do you see any advantage in a variety of scales arranged by different Boards: is there no advantage in a system of elasticity: do you believe in a rigid, cast-iron system under which no experiment can be tried?—I cannot speak as to that, but only on behalf of the teachers. In some of the education districts in this colony the teachers are inadequately paid—I mean to say as regards teachers in similar positions in other districts.

279. Do you think it is the fault of the Boards that they are not adequately paid?—If they all got the same amount of capitation as we get I do not see why their teachers should be paid less salaries than our teachers.

280. Do you think, if the other Boards got more money, they would treat their teachers in the same manner as your Board treats the teachers in this district?—I understand that why they do not do so is on account of the number of small schools.

281. Do you not think that could be rectified by altering the capitation grant on a sliding scale—giving an increased grant to the small schools—increasing the grant from £3 15s. to £5, according to the size of the schools?—Yes; in fact we have to do that now.

282. Is that not a way out of the difficulty?—Yes; that is the only way out of the difficulty.

283. If a scheme of that kind is provided you think the Education Boards would make good use of their money and pay their teachere fairly?—Yes.

284. You believe in an elastic scheme?—Yes, an elastic scheme, but at the same time a uniform scheme on some general principle laid down.

285. Who would you intrust the laying of it down to?—The department should be equal to that.

286. Suppose a Council of Education was established, consisting of delegates from the thirteen different Education Boards, and was appointed to meet once a year and devise a general scheme of staff and salaries, do you think that would be less advantageous than leaving the matter to the Government of the day?—I do not think it would be necessary to have an annual meeting of delegates, but I think a meeting of such delegates would devise a scheme and recommend it to the department, and see how it would succeed—it would be an experiment.

287. Do you think that would be preferable to throwing everything into the hands of the State?—Yes; I think it would. The men would be experienced, and it would be an advantage to them to keep together and compare notes with each other on the management of the different districts.

288. If the teachers of New Zealand generally are to have their salaries increased under any proposed scheme, is that not likely to add very materially to the cost of education?—Very likely. I think there are a great number of salaries that do not require increasing beyond a certain amount—some I would not increase at all.

289. Do you think those teachers enjoying salaries that are high, and which do not need increasing, if they are clamouring for an increase, are unreasonable?—Yes; I think they are.

289A. Would you approve of raising all salaries to the highest level to be found in any part of New Zealand—the salaries of assistants and others?—I should like to see that done if the funds would admit of it.

290. Supposing that that was done, and hard times came upon the colony, what do you think would happen then: would the teachers be safer in the hands of the Government of the day than in the hands of Boards?—The Boards would be able to do nothing unless the Government gave them the necessary funds.

291. You do not look upon the Boards as being the "buffers" between the Government and the teachers?—No.

292. You do not think the Boards would interpose if there was any outcry for retrenchment? —No; they could not do it.

293. Do you not think the Government to some extent is amenable to the demands of the Boards?—You have to so devise a scheme as to render the money Parliament votes to be distributed in the fairest way.

294. Would you be in favour of a reduction of staff in order to increase the salaries of the teachers?—No; not if the reduction of the staff would be injurious to the educational interests of the children—certainly not.

295. Well, then, who do you think should perform a correct opinion as to the size of staff necessary for your district schools?—I think that such a meeting as you suggest—a meeting of delegates from the different districts, meeting with the head of the department—would be sufficient.

296. Do you think that would be better than leaving it to the Government?—I should leave it entirely to the delegates and the Education Department, who would make the matter a special study.

297. Would you leave it to the department without any delegates at all?—I think the department would be glad to get the assistance of the delegates.

298. Do you think it would be a wise thing to intrust the department solely with that power, in the same way as the head of the Postal Department has the power to arrange his staff and make appointments?—I think that is a much more simple thing.

299. In your district does the Board make any alterations from time to time in the staffing of the schools, transferring the teachers from one class to another, or is it left to the Committees?—It is left to the headmaster; the Board looks to the headmaster to control those matters.

300. Can the headmaster, without any reference to the Board, move a teacher from one department in a school into another department, or another class?—Yes.

301. Without reference to the Board or Committee?—Yes.

302. Assuming that means disrating or not, as the case may be, can the headmaster in an arbitary way move teachers about?—Well, yes, in this way; that if he found a teacher whom he had appointed to a certain standard was incompetent to teach that standard as it should be taught, then he would be justified in reducing that teacher to a lower standard and getting some one in his or her place.

303. If a teacher is appointed to a certain position with a certain salary, can a headmaster, without any explanation to either a Board or a Committee, take a teacher from that position and place him in a position where he would be obtaining a lower salary?—The Board would hold the headmaster responsible for the management of his school and its proper conduct, and I think it is one of those cases which should be referred by the headmaster to the Inspector; I think the Inspector, under such circumstances, after consulting with the headmaster, should advise what should be done, and whatever was done would be in accordance with the recommendations of the Inspector.

G. T. Fannin, Secretary to the Hawke's Bay Education Board, examined.

304. *Mr. Davidson.*] If your Board paid salaries according to the scale drawn up by this Commission, do you think that would in any way weaken the control of the Board over its teachers? —I cannot say it would.

305. You know there are thirteen different scales of staffing and thirteen different scales of salaries in the colony, and you know that the inequalities in salaries paid to teachers are very great: do you think, in the interests of education, that these inequalities should exist?—It would depend very much on the circumstances under which teachers are placed—cost of living, and so on.

306. If the conditions of living were equal, do you not think that two men holding similar qualifications and positions should receive a similar rate of pay?—Certainly.

307. Under a uniform scale of staffing and a uniform scale of salary drawn up by this Commission after having visited thirteen education districts, and after having taken evidence, do you think such a scale would be in the interests of education?—I can hardly answer that question.

308. You think, however, that something should be done to remove the present inequalities? —Yes.

309. *Mr. Stewart.*] What building grant did you receive last year?—£4,574, including the special-settlement grant.

310. Did that include £700 for Kaikora?—Yes.

311. Can you tell me what you spent in building last year?—£5,234 7s. 6d.

312. Had you any credit balance to the Building Account at the beginning of the year?—The account was in debit £231 16s. 10d.

313. You had a very considerable sum—something like £1,000—additional for the building fund during that year?—We got from the school fund £835.

314. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the suggested scale with the scale that obtains in Hawke's Bay?—The Chairman of the Education Board and myself have gone through it, and my answer would be just the same as his on the matter.

315. In the return that is sent in to the department with the salaries paid, does that include house allowance?—Yes; house allowance, bonus, and everything else.

316. Do you consider that the salaries paid to pupil-teachers are sufficiently high?—As a rule, I think so.

317. Have you any difficulty in getting male pupil-teachers?—Great difficulty.

318. Is the reason that there is so little prospect of getting positions afterwards, or is it the poor salaries that are paid?—No; I think they prefer to go into the bush.

319. What do you think should be the lowest minimum for a male and a female teacher respectively?—I should say, £80 and £100.

320. Do you find in the lowest class of country schools and the lowest class of town schools that females are as efficient as males?—The object in having female teachers in the small schools was that they can teach sewing, whereas a master would have to supply one.

321. Do females get a preference on account of being able to teach sewing?—I should say so.

322. Do you consider that up to a certain limit in the attendance of country schools females can as efficiently conduct that school as can males?—I think so.

323. Do you consider that the increase of salary paid to teachers should be based on each unit of attendance, or should the increase be made by grades?—By the unit; each individual should cause an increase.

324. *Mr. Hill.*] Is there any difference in the payment paid to male and female teachers in the smaller schools?—No.

325. Have not all teachers in Hawke's Bay always been paid an increase for every increase in attendance, both head-teachers and assistants?—Yes.

Miss J. C. Brown, representing Women Teachers, examined.

Miss Brown: At a meeting of women teachers held in Napier on the 31st May it was resolved that two of their number—Miss Brown, first assistant mistress of the Napier Main School, and Miss Ferguson, assistant mistress of the Taradale School—should bring before the notice of the Commission the way in which the proposed colonial scale of salaries and staff would affect women teachers. The proposed scale claims to "improve the efficiency of the schools by increasing and strengthening the staff." It is proposed to give an assistant teacher when the average attendance at a school reaches 36, and in a school with an average of over 100 to give an assistant instead of a pupil-teacher. That it would be an advantage to have all classes taught by qualified teachers is beyond question, but with the limited funds available for educational purposes the only way in which the number of assistants can be increased is by cutting down the salaries of almost all the assistant teachers. Though true men and women will not regulate their efforts by the amount of salary received, capable men and women, whose aim it always is to bring to a successful issue whatever they undertake, will naturally seek more remunerative callings. And, again, it would be very undesirable to have the schools staffed by men and women who are not persons of refinement and culture. To lower the salaries is most assuredly to introduce a commoner element into the profession. So far as Hawke's Bay is concerned, teachers have no occasion to complain of the staffing of schools. They work hard, but are not overburdened. It is because they feel that they cannot afford to have their work lessened at their own expense that they are taking this opportunity of objecting to the proposed scale. This applies, of course, to teachers in general; but it is for women in particular that our appeal is made. We think that if a woman is in charge of a small school she should receive the salary that would be paid to a man; but we do not ask that schools with an average attendance of over 65 should be given to women. Though the proposed scale claims to "increase generally the salaries paid to women, especially to those in responsible positions," there are only three women teachers in Hawke's Bay who would receive any increase. We think that women in charge of departments, whether in small or large schools, should be paid at a rate corresponding to their responsibilities. The children in the lower department earn the capitation just as the bigger ones do, and in schools of up to 200 children fully half, sometimes more, are in the lower department. A mistress in such a school is in charge of more than half the pupils for more than half their school career. This, together with the additional duties devolving upon a mistress of teaching sewing and drill to the girls, caring for their general welfare and behaviour, preparing female pupil-teachers for their sewing examinations, and breaking in pupil-teachers and making them useful, makes the position of any first assistant mistress no sinecure; and yet under the proposed seale such a mistress would receive £95 or £100 a year. This is surely no just acknowledgment of experience and ability. We cannot understand why the salaries paid to female assistants in the larger schools should be so diverse, ranging, as they are proposed to do, from £80 to £140 in the largest school, and from £80 to £120 in schools of 750 to 780. All are class-teachers, and have similar and, as nearly as possible, equal work. Beyond a certain limit, the size of a school does not add to the work of an assistant; why, then, should it add to the salary? We do not consider that £80 a year is a living-wage for any woman away from home. We think it would be more satisfactory if the assistants in the larger schools were classified as first- and second-class assistants, and paid not less than £125 in the first class, and as nearly £100 in the second class as funds will allow. We do not ask that women teachers shall be paid as highly as men; but we do consider that a woman who makes teaching her life-work should have something more than the privilege of knowing that she is conferring a benefit upon the community to repay her for the time and trouble spent in fitting herself to hold a responsible position. One matter of importance has been overlooked in drawing up the colonial scale—viz., a system of promotion and appointment of teachers. While the final selection rests in the hands of School Committees teachers cannot get fair-play. Those who are not known to Committees have but little chance of receiving their support, though they may have done their duty and given satisfaction to the Inspectors. In conclusion, we do not consider the proposed scale confers any benefit upon women teachers.

326. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you not think a lady should be on this Commission: are not women as interested as men in this matter?—Quite as much.

327. Do you not think the mothers of the colony take as much interest in education as the fathers?—Yes, and very often more.

328. Then, do you not think that in a Commission set up to consider this question there might have been a lady included?—I do not see why they should not have had a lady representative on this Commission.

329. You think £80 is not sufficient for a lady teacher?—It is not a living-wage.

330. Do you think that £100 should be the minimum wage?—Yes.

331. What would you fix as the minimum wage for men for similar work?—Up to schools of 65 I think women should get as much as men.

332. It has been contended, as against the equal payment of men and women, that there is a larger percentage of illness among women: is that your experience?—No; I have been teaching for twenty-three years, and have had very little illness.

333. You have not studied the second proposed scale?—It is very much better than the first as far as assistants are concerned.

334. Do you approve of the amended scheme?—I would say it is very much better.

335. In regard to promotions, have you thought out what would be a very good plan?—No.

336. *Mr. Davidson.*] In the first scale did you notice that the term "infant mistress" did not appear for the first female assistant until a school of 250 had been reached: do you consider that the alternative scale is an improvement in that matter?—It takes away from them the position of headmistress, and calls them infant mistress.

337. Between 40 and 50 the female would have to take the infants and Standards I. and II.: do you think it adds to the dignity of the position to call her infant mistress?—I suppose it would.

338. Do you prefer the title "infant mistress" to that of "first assistant"?—I do not think it is a matter of any consequence.

339. Have you ever been in sole charge of a school?—Never.

340. You think that men and women should be paid at the same rate until a school reaches an average attendance of 65. The salary suggested for that class of school ranges from £170 to £185: supposing that that salary obtained in such schools, and the positions were thrown open to either sex, do you think that the salary is sufficient for a man to marry upon?—I suppose a man with a salary of £185 would be able to keep a wife.

341. If those positions were thrown open to both sexes, do you think a School Committee would prefer to take a married man with his wife into the district rather than a single woman—considering that they were equally well qualified?—I could not speak for the Committees on a matter of that sort.

342. You notice that in the first suggested scale the minimum salary for an infant mistress is £80, and that the second scale raises that by £10?—Yes.

343. What is the average attendance at your school at present?—755.

344. And the salary attaching to the position of infant mistress there?—According to the new scale, £180.

345. At present?—At present I get £168; I am one of the three teachers who would be benefited by the new scale.

346. Have you compared the salaries suggested in the alternative with those under the first scheme?—Yes.

347. Did you find the second a great improvement on the first?—Yes.

348. Did you consider the staffing allowed for the various schools?—Yes.

349. Do you think the staffing is sufficient?—Yes.

350. *Mr. Stewart.*] Can you tell me which the lady teachers of Hawke's Bay prefer—the colonial scale, or to remain as at present?—The Hawke's Bay lady teachers are perfectly satisfied with what they get.

351. You have considered this from the point of view of salary?—Yes.

352. How many male pupil-teachers have you in the school?—Three, I think.

353. And how many females?—Six, I think.

354. Have you been long in the Hawke's Bay District?—Twelve years.

355. In considering the suggested scale at your meeting you went into the question of staffing?—Yes.

356. Did you consider it was satisfactory?—Yes.

357. Did you go into the question of equal pay for males and females?—Yes, up to a certain point.

358. Did you consider whether equal pay for males and females would have a good or bad effect on the prospects of female teachers?—I do not see why it should have a bad effect.

359. Did not the position occur to you that if placed on equal terms in competition it would lead to preference being given to males?—We only want equal pay up to a certain size of school.

360. *Mr. Luke.*] Have you read the Minister of Education's annual report?—Yes.

361. Have you noticed that some of the lady teachers in other districts receive not much more than half the salary you receive?—Yes.

362. Do you not think that it is advisable that lady teachers should receive the same salaries for the same work done in each education district?—Yes.

363. Supposing that could not be done except by a colonial scale, do you not think it is advisable that a colonial scale should be formulated and become law as soon as possible?—Yes, so long as it would be to the benefit of all teachers.

364. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Has the question of minimum certificates been discussed by the lady teachers?—No.

365. Were you in the service of the Board at the time the last reduction was made in the way of doing away with the bonus?—Yes.

366. Did the teachers look upon the bonus as part of their salary at the time?—Yes; but we have always understood that there was an "if" in respect to the bonus.

367. And in the event of its being taken away you had no grounds of complaint?—We made no complaint, for we knew it was always subject to the Board having the money.

368. *Mr. Hill.*] What position do you occupy at the present time in the Napier School?—At the present time I suppose I am both headmistress and infant mistress.

369. How long have you been acting as infant mistress?—Since February.

370. If you were called "mistress" would it make any difference to you?—No, I suppose not.

371. You recognise that you can be removed by the headmaster from class to class?—Yes.

372. And the head-teacher has found it necessary to move you from one class to take charge of the infants?—Yes.

373. Did you object to that change?—No.

374. Did you consider it a degradation in being put down?—I did not consider I was being put down.

375. Had you formerly done the same kind of work?—Yes, down South. I was infant-teacher until I came to Napier.

376. Supposing the headmaster put you to a higher class, would you think your status changed?—No.

377. You deem, whatever change the headmaster makes, he makes for the general well-being of the school?—Yes.

378. How many pupils do you think you could efficiently teach in Standard IV.?—I have been able to take 80 with the help of a trainee who assisted me in the work.

379. Do you think you could manage a school of 30?—Yes; I think I could manage a school of 40.

380. For a school of 30 do you think you deserve the same salary as a male would get if in charge of the school?—Certainly.

381. Do you think that the first and second assistant masters and mistresses should be paid more approximately than at the present time?—I think the first assistant master should be well paid. He has to take charge of the school if the headmaster is away.

382. Supposing the headmaster is sick and the first assistant is sick, who would take charge of the work?—I do not know.

383. Do you think that the ladies' salaries should be more approximate?—I do no think there should be such a great difference between them.

384. And do you think the third and fourth assistants should be more approximate?—Yes.

385. *Mr. Weston.*] I suppose all the young lady teachers have discussed the wisdom and propriety of having a colonial scale?—Yes.

386. And they have arrived at a conclusion upon the subject, have they not?—Yes.

387. And you are advocating a colonial scale accordingly, are you not?—I am really advocating that ladies' salaries should not be so much lower.

388. Are you, as lady-teachers' representative, advocating a colonial scale?—No, I did not come to do that. Ladies have no objection to a colonial scale so long as it does not cause the ladies to suffer.

389. All you care about is that the ladies should not suffer?—Yes; I am here to speak on their behalf.

390. So that it does not matter to you what scale there is so long as you receive proper remuneration for the work you perform?—Yes; but all over New Zealand, and not for one district only.

391. Would you have proper remuneration, then, under the colonial scale, or would you leave each Board to frame its own scale?—In that sense the colonial scale would be the better.

392. Then, after all, do you favour a colonial scale—it comes to that, does it not?—Yes.

393. Well, then, if the young ladies in counsel assembled advocate a colonial scale qualified as stated, why do you advocate a colonial scale as distinct from a scale framed by each Board in the colony?—I suppose under a colonial scale all the lady teachers in the colony in the different grades will have equal salaries.

394. Then, do you mean to say that the Boards in the colony will not be just and fair to the young ladies in the apportioning of the salaries?—We are quite satisfied that our Board is just and fair.

395. If you young ladies are satisfied with the conduct of your own Board, why should you think that the young ladies in the other districts are dissatisfied with their Boards?—I suppose we only took the case of the salaries paid under the other Boards.

396. If you are satisfied with the paternal conduct of your own Board, why think that the other Boards in the other parts of the colony will not be just and fair to their lady teachers?—I suppose it is arguing from our own standpoint; if we were under those Boards we would be inclined to petition against it.

397. I suppose you feel, therefore, that you would like to form a union to secure justice all round?—Yes.

398. So far as you are concerned, I apprehend you do not care whether you have a colonial scale or whether you do not?—For ourselves in Hawke's Bay we do not, but for the sake of our sisters elsewere we do.

399. *The Chairman.*] In your experience, which has been extensive, in this district have you found the male teachers break down at their work?—No. There have been a few cases.

400. Because occasionally a male teacher's health breaks down, do you think they should be prevented from following the teaching profession?—No.

401. Do you think ladies should take charge of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards?—I think they are quite as capable as men of doing so.

402. Do you think male teachers would be anxious to see lady teachers paid inferior salaries if they thought it would be the means of preventing their getting employment, and securing for

the lady teachers employment: do you think male teachers would be anxious to do anything that would turn them out of their present employment, and substitute women in their places?—No, I do not suppose they would.

Miss PHEBE FERGUSON, representing Women Teachers, examined.

403. *Mr. Stewart.*] Which do you think would be best for the lady teachers of the colony—to have thirteen different scales of payment under thirteen different Boards, or one uniform scale of payment for the whole colony?—One scale of payment would be much better.

404. I take it, then, you are in favour of a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes; but I do not think the proposed scale is all that is to be desired.

405. Where are you teaching?—At Taradale.

406. Are you in charge of the school?—No; there are two masters, a mistress, and three pupil-teachers.

407. What is your salary?—£96.

408. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] What is the average attendance?—About 160 for this quarter.

409. Have you noticed how the suggested amended scale would affect a school like yours?—The proposed scale would allow us to keep our assistant master, who under the present scale has got to leave, as the attendance has fallen.

410. Have the lady teachers passed a resolution in favour of the colonial scale?—No; but I think they are all in favour of one.

411. What do you consider is a fair difference between the salaries paid to male and female teachers?—I think men and women can hardly compete with one another. Certain work falls to a woman, and certain work to a man.

412. You consider that where a woman can do the work just as efficiently as a man she should get the same salary?—Yes. In the small schools where the teacher might be either a woman or a man they should get the same salary.

413. Up to what number do you think a female teacher can teach as efficiently as a man?—That depends on the teacher; we thought 65 was a fair number.

414. Is it a fact that females get the preference up to 80?—Sometimes a Committee will prefer a man to a woman.

415. Then, you do not exclude the applications of male teachers for such appointments?—No.

416. *Mr. Hill.*] You approve of the colonial scale as proposed?—No, I do not.

417. Would you prefer the colonial scale to the present system?—I think it is only fair to teachers in all districts that they should receive the same salary for the same work.

418. Throughout the colony, all the lady teachers having a department similar to your own should have equal salaries?—Yes.

419. Supposing, in order to do so, they took £10 from your salary, what would you say then?—If that is the only way of doing it, I am quite willing to make that sacrifice. I would then only get £80, which I do not think is a living-wage.

420. Given the same duties and the same responsibility, you think that the salary should be the same, whether the teacher be male or female?—Yes.

FRIDAY, 14TH JUNE, 1901.

J. D. WATSON, M.A., President of the Hawke's Bay Branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Watson: I am here in order to represent the Hawke's Bay Branch of the Teachers' Institute, of which I am president. I am not here to represent any particular interest or any particular faction, but the male and female teachers of Hawke's Bay. I was appointed to that position by the largest and most representative gathering of teachers, male and female, ever held, I understand, in Hawke's Bay. I think I should like to say before continuing my statement that we, as teachers, so far as the abstract principle of a colonial scale is concerned, are practically unanimous. We believe that the time has come when the tentative experience of the thirteen Boards of the colony should be gathered into one. We believe that would only be an extension of the principle which has always been adopted in our educational system in New Zealand—namely, making the less developed districts be helped by the more developed ones. Without being either an individualist or a socialist, I think this matter of education should be looked at from the point of view of the solidarity of the nation. The nation is an organism, and whatever affects one of its parts, either for good or evil, must affect the whole, and therefore the burden should be borne by the whole; we believe that is a right principle—a just principle. I might also say, not only on behalf of the teachers of the Hawke's Bay District, but on behalf of the teachers throughout New Zealand generally, that we have been actuated in this matter by no mean or selfish spirit. Although this question relating to salaries has a great social bearing, I believe that the impelling influence behind the whole movement has been not a social one, but an educational one. I believe that strongly and firmly. We knew, of course, that no colonial scale could be adopted that would affect in exactly the same manner financially every individual. Had a colonial scale done so there would have been no need for one. We knew that, even with increased capitation, there would likely occur instances of reduction as well as increases, but we believe that a colonial scale would benefit the great majority of the profession. Every provincial scale has been more or less tentative; each one was introduced to suit a set of circumstances which have more or less passed away. In Hawke's Bay, for example, I believe there may have been a time when it may have suited the circumstances of the district, and may have been a good scale for the time being; but, those circumstances having changed, that time has passed by. When I make the statement that the Hawke's Bay scale is one

of the worst in New Zealand, I do not refer to the fact that the teachers are worse paid in the Hawke's Bay District. I mean that the scale is based on a very bad principle. The tendency of the Hawke's Bay scale has been, and is now, to foster the largest class of schools at the expense of the smaller and medium country schools. In the largest school in Hawke's Bay, I find, referring to the return of 1900, that the Board spent on the largest school £2 15s. 6d. per head.

421. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you mean in salaries?—Yes; and emoluments to teachers, not including extra tuition, such as technical work—or work conducted by Mr. Anderson—I do not refer to that. In Wellington in the same year they conducted their largest school at a cost of £2 4s. 4d., in Auckland the cost was £2 11s. 1d., in Canterbury £2 8s. 9d., in Otago £2 10s. 2d.; so that you will see that Hawke's Bay's largest school is by far the most expensive school in the Colony of New Zealand.

422. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] It is not a medium-sized school?—No; it is the largest class of school. In Hawke's Bay the largest school is about 800 in attendance, sometimes a little over, and sometimes a little under. The point I wish to bring out is this: that, while the largest school in Hawke's Bay is the most expensive of the large schools of the colony, and not the cheapest in the district, the peculiar thing is this: that in every other district the largest school is the cheapest. I find that in Hawke's Bay a school of 300 costs annually £2 13s. 6d., or 2s. less than the largest school. So far as I can see, the instance I have mentioned is the only one of the kind in New Zealand. Under the proposed scale (I mean the amended proposed scale) our largest school (with an attendance of, say, 800) would lose 9s. 5d. per head, and be still better off than Wellington by 1s. 9d.; Auckland would lose 5s. per head; North Canterbury about 2s. 8d. per head; and, so far as I can make out, Otago 4s. 1d. This does not take into account the promised additions to assistants to bring them up to the Otago scale. In schools of 300 in attendance all over New Zealand there would be a gain.

423. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you mean in the cost and maintenance of the schools?—Yes; there would be no loss in schools of 300, especially in connection with the provinces I mention. I may say all these figures are taken from the last return of 1900. In schools of about 300 the gain would be—in Hawke's Bay, 6s. per head; Canterbury, 8s.; Otago, 3s. 5d.; Auckland, 7s.; and Wellington, 11s. Thus you will see Wellington would have the greatest gain. Take another class of schools—schools with an attendance of 100: There would be a gain in all those provinces except in Wellington, and, of course, the gain would be very large in Hawke's Bay, where these schools are very poorly paid.

424. *Mr. Davidson.*] Those are the medium-sized schools?—Yes. I should mention in schools of about 100 in attendance the cost in Hawke's Bay is £3 per head, Wellington, £4 3s. 5d.; Auckland, £3 3s. 3d.; Canterbury, £3 4s. 6d.; Otago, £3 10s. 2d.; while the proposed scale suggests £3 11s. for schools of that size. Therefore you will see that the gain to Hawke's Bay would be 11s., while in Otago it would be only 9d.

425. *The Chairman.*] Wellington would lose?—Yes; 12s. 5d. in those schools occupied by male teachers.

426. *Mr. Hogben.*] Is that on the Wellington scale, or on the Wellington payments?—On the payments according to the return of 1900. In schools of about 30 pupils the Hawke's Bay scale is £4 1s. 11d. In Wellington I could not make out what the payment was from the returns, as there was so much diversity; but some schools of that size (30) receive £6 per head; in Auckland, so far as I can make out, it is £4 7s. 9d. for male teachers. The figures for this class of schools are very uncertain, because it is difficult to understand the returns, there is so much difference between the salaries of male and female teachers in some districts. In Canterbury they spend £4 11s. 8d., and in Otago, which is the highest, £4 16s. 9d. The proposed scale is £4 10s. on these schools for males.

427. You are referring to the alternative scale?—Yes; I think the alternative is higher than in Otago.

428. *Mr. Stewart.*] On what basis do you calculate assistants' salaries?—On the amended scale.

429. How do you arrive at the assistants' salaries in the amended scale?—Where the amended scale says two assistants I looked at the original scale to see what the salaries of those assistants would be, and based my calculation upon that.

430. *Mr. Hill.*] I would like you to give me the proposed cost of the largest class of schools?—£2 6s. 1d. on schools like that of Napier for salaries only.

431. *Mr. Hogben.*] Are you including house allowance in your figures?—Yes; in my figures for Hawke's Bay scale. I have merely given these statistics with the view of proving one thing, and it is this: that in Hawke's Bay the tendency of our scale is to foster the largest class of school at the expense of the smaller and middle classes of schools. I use the word "foster," but I believe I should have used the word "choke," because the educational effect is a bad one. Comparing the amended scale, and taking the assistants' salaries as given in the original scale, with the exception of the infant mistress, in Hawke's Bay only one school in the district would lose, and that is the largest and most expensive school. We have two other schools of about 500 in attendance, and a school of 500 would gain about 1s. 3d. per head. Some of the teachers' salaries on that basis would be reduced, but others would be raised, and an addition to the staff in some instances would be provided. Taking the school of 800 in attendance, which is the normal strength of our school here, and taking its present staff, it gives 55 pupils to each teacher and 80 to each certificated teacher. The first assistant in that school would get £291 5s.; and the master, the head-teacher—this is the point I wish to bring out—in a school with an attendance of 300 in Hawke's Bay would get £253 15s.; this does not include a house. If we allow for a house the salaries would be practically equal; that is to say, that a first assistant in the school here gets as much as a master of a school

of 300 in attendance. Now, contrast the two positions and the requirements necessary for them. If an assistant master in a school of that size has the skill and experience necessary to manage a school of 300, then I say he is not in his right place; he is not needed there; and he should be somewhere else where he is needed. I am also of the opinion that any teacher who remains an assistant in a large school, and who never has charge of a school of his own, never perfectly learns his profession. He may be an excellent teacher, but there is a great distinction between a teacher and a schoolmaster. Contrasting those same two schools again, there are 80 pupils in the large school to each certificated teacher, and in the school of 300 there are only three certificated teachers, with 100 pupils to each. It must also be remembered that in this latter instance there cannot be one teacher for each standard, or anything like it. In the proposed scale the staffing would remain the same for that class of school—that is, the large school in Hawke's Bay—but the 300 school would receive five certificated teachers instead of three, and one pupil-teacher less. I would like to point out some facts relating to the female teachers. A fifth assistant mistress in the Napier school—the last assistant added (she ranks as eighth assistant, the lowest junior assistant—receives a salary of £96 10s., while an assistant mistress in a school with an average attendance of 100 pupils, a mistress who occupies a much more responsible position, only gets £89 10s. The proposed scale would reduce the one to £80, and increase the other to £105, a most equitable principle. The infant mistress in a school of an attendance of 126—and no one can say that that is not a very responsible position—is paid £95 10s., and this junior female assistant in the Napier school gets £1 a year more. There is more to be said in connection with these assistants. If a teacher who finishes her pupil-teachership course and gets a certificate—and it is generally teachers of that class who get appointed to these positions—if she has the "grit," and the strength, and the courage to go out to the back blocks, and to occupy one of these small schools with an average attendance of 20, where the conditions of life are unfavourable and the difficulties (as I have heard them described by Mr. Hill) are tremendous, and to be the centre of light and civilisation for the whole of such a district, that girl gets £90 a year under our present scale, while the lady who elects to stay in town and live among her friends, and walk to school with dry boots, gets £96 10s. for the lowest junior position of the school. In this connection I speak for the female teachers of Hawke's Bay. When such instances as I have pointed out occur under our scale, who can any longer speak of the glories of that scale? We have heard too much about that, and I think there are things here which would prompt me to say that, instead of being a glorious scale, it is an iniquitous one. A third assistant mistress in the Napier school, with two lady teachers and two or three male teachers holding higher positions on the staff, gets £120 a year; but the sole infant mistress in a school of 200 children only gets a salary of £110 15s. The proposed scale would reduce the one to £100, and raise the other to £120.

432. That is the first scale?—Yes.

433. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you approve of that?—Yes; I approve of reducing one in order to raise the other. We look at the educational effect of a just distribution of the money. I find that in Hawke's Bay—I am taking the whole province—the new scale would take something off the salaries of about twenty-four female teachers, so far as I can make out, and it is the junior assistants in the big schools who would lose a little.

434. You have incorporated the alternative scale with the first scale?—Yes; twenty-four females would suffer a reduction, and twenty-six would gain, and the twenty-six who would gain are the sole mistresses of country schools, and the first assistant mistresses of all schools, large and small. In this province, therefore, taking the new scale and comparing it with our own, seventy-four schools would gain, and only one school would lose. Can you wonder, then, that the teachers of Hawke's Bay are in favour of a colonial scale? There seemed to be a little difficulty among the members of the Commission with regard to understanding the position of schools here under 80 in attendance, and I would like to point out this: that in schools under 80 there is a regulation set down that female teachers are preferred. That regulation has for many years, so far as I can see, been a dead-letter—in fact, it is a dead-letter altogether. I have no doubt that in the earlier days of Hawke's Bay, when efficient male teachers were scarce, a good many of those schools were officered by females. At the present moment the tendency in Hawke's Bay is that all schools over 40 in attendance fall to a male teacher, and not a female. I might point out that of schools of that kind, between 40 and 80 in attendance, we have twenty-two at the present time, fourteen of them being controlled by men and eight by women. The certificates of the male teachers are as follows: three B2's, two D1's, four D2's, three D3's, one E2, and one E3. The eight female teachers, with one exception, were put in charge of those schools when the attendance was under 40, and the tendency for these schools is, if they increase above 40, to become officered by males if the present teacher leaves. In the last five or six years I know four or five of these schools occupied by women which have become vacant, and in each case the position was then filled by a male teacher. Now, my case for a colonial scale, in addition to the facts that I have already adduced; is based largely on the Hawke's Bay scale. As a point in favour of the introduction of a colonial scale, I have pointed out that the educational effects of this scale are bad, and that the scale is badly based; and what hope of changing it is there under a parochial system? No hope at all. There are in the Colony of New Zealand 1,492 schools under 150 in attendance, and only 153 over 150 in attendance, so that it is very clear that if teachers' positions generally are to be improved it is the positions of teachers, occupying schools under 150 in attendance. There has been a great deal said about the difficulty of getting male pupil-teachers, but I do not think it is because they are poorly paid. I believe both male and female pupil-teachers are by no means underpaid anywhere. It is not the pay that will attract them into the profession; it is the prospects they will have to look forward to in the future. To induce pupil-teachers to enter the profession by offering them large salaries would have a bad effect, and would draw the wrong class of boys. I think if you do not offer too much you will get boys of more "grit."

Those who enter the profession merely because of the inducement offered them in the way of large salaries at the beginning are not the best candidates. One would imagine that, after I have shown how poorly paid are the country schools in comparison with the large town school, the education in the country schools would be on that account deficient; but it is not so. The educational efficiency is quite as high. I believe the Hawke's Bay District, including every class of school, both large and small, is a most efficient educational district; I think the Commission have already seen evidence of that in our largest school; and I think it is my duty, as representing chiefly the interests of the small schools, to say something in regard to the efficiency of those schools to show the consideration they deserve. In some educational districts, in the case of scholarships, there is a differentiation made in the syllabus for the work of country children and town children. In this district they are all on an equal footing, large and small, so that the results may be compared in order to show the efficiency of the country schools as compared with the efficiency of the town schools. I have taken the scholarship results for the last five years. In 1896, eleven country children were placed among the first twenty, and nine town children; in 1897, ten country children and ten town children, the results being equal; in 1898, nine country children gained positions among the first twenty, and eleven town children; in 1899, there were eight country children and twelve town children; in 1900, there were fifteen country children and five town children. In order to show you that those country children were not represented by simply the schools immediately below the three largest I will give you the returns for last year. Every class of school below 500 is well represented. Two children from a school of 100 in attendance gained positions among the first twenty; two came from a school of 157, two from a school of 159, two from a school of 335, one from a small school of 26 pupils, one from a school of 65, one from a school of 66, one from a school of 116, one from a school of 140, one from a school of 100, one from a school of 290. If you take the number attending these country schools and the number attending the three town schools you will find that last year 9 out of every 1,000 country children attained that position, while in the town 2·8 out of every 1,000 attained it. Those are only the statistics for last year. Taking the average for five years, the figures for the country are fifty-three children, and for the town forty-seven children. Taking an average by a rough method, that gives the advantage on the side of the town. I work it out that the average number is 6·8 for the country out of 1,000, and 5·3 for the town. I think that speaks volumes for the efficiency of the country schools. What I maintain is that, under our present Hawke's Bay scale, that condition of affairs will never be maintained. It has never been produced by that scale, and will never be maintained by it. Unless things are altered the efficiency of the country schools in this district will decidedly deteriorate; that is my firm opinion; and it is those schools we need to try to benefit. I might give you a few more figures in regard to this matter. To raise that number of efficient country pupils it cost in salaries £4,764—that is, for one year. For the three town schools the expense was £5,363; that is to say, the town schools in the matter of scholarships cost £599 more.

435. And for less scholarships?—Yes, that is the very point. I might mention that the country children had a disadvantage, a slight disadvantage; drawing is a subject in the scholarship curriculum that carries about one-eighth of the total marks—100 out of 850. In the town school here they have the advantage of a special teacher in that subject, and yet in spite of this the country schools have been able to hold their own. Now, we country teachers like to see these special advantages to the big schools—we are not at all jealous about it. The influence of it extends to the other schools, and we believe money should be spent in giving these special advantages if it is possible to do so. But if the Hawke's Bay scale was so arranged that the assistance in the town schools were forced to go into the country schools, would not that influence be increased tenfold? That is my contention—I believe that the largest schools in every district should be the training-places for the other schools. There is one subject in connection with the matter of scholarships that I did not mention, and I would like to call the special attention of the Commission to the point. I showed that within the last five years fifty-three country children and forty-seven town children were among the first twenty in the examination for scholarships, but it does not follow that fifty-three country children got scholarships. One would expect that; but it is not the way things are done in Hawke's Bay. I believe the practice of this Board is to give their own scholarships, so far as the money will go, to the highest. A country child needs £30 and a town child £10, and the practice of this Board is to give scholarships to the highest, whether they are from the town or the country. There is, however, another class of scholarships—I refer to the Commissioners——

436. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you mean the School Commissioners?—Yes; they prefer to give three scholarships at £10 each in the town to one scholarship at £30 in the country. I cannot see that this is on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number; we know that the greatest benefit to the greatest number would be to encourage the brightest child. It must be some other principle that they act upon, and the only principle that I can see is this: that when £30 goes to the country it brings in a revenue to the High School in Napier of £10 in fees, and if £30 goes to the town it brings in a revenue to the High School of £30. I do not know whether that is the reason, but it seems to me to be the only one. With regard to teachers' certificates, in Hawke's Bay we strongly believe that there should be a classification of teachers and a classification of schools also; if teachers are graded there is no doubt that schools should be also graded, and we are very glad to see that principle recognised in the proposed colonial scale. I do not think we believe it is recognised in the right way; but, be that as it may, we are glad to see that it is recognised in some way. For my own part, I do not believe in penalising a teacher as is proposed in the suggested scale. I do not think it is a good system. I know men of ripe experience and training who perhaps only hold an E certificate, and I do not think it is right that they should be penalised. Instead of penalising, I think it could be done in this way: it could be made a law that in all new

appointments the appointment must be according to grade if the teachers are to be found. That would also break down the provincialism or parochialism which now prevails, and would give teachers a chance of promotion, and that without penalising old teachers. It is not legal now to appoint a non-certificated teacher where a certificated teacher is available, and I should like to see the same principle applied to the grades. That does not commit me to an approval of those grades as they stand, for we do not approve of them. I believe that the whole system of teachers' certificates is far too cumbersome, though there is one principle that needs to be retained. The certificate should embody the two sets of qualification—literary attainment and experience. In Hawke's Bay we believe that the grades of certificates should be reduced very much, certainly to not more than three or four classes. In order to secure the lowest one, no amount of literary attainment should be sufficient, and no amount of experience should give the highest one. What we say is that for the lowest class of certificates a certain amount of literary attainment, *plus* apprenticeship, should be demanded; for the second, more literary attainment, *plus* two years' experience—that is, approved experience; for a third rise, more literary attainment, *plus* more experience and skill; and these to be included in the certificates, and the certificates to be simplified in that direction. I do not say what direction the literary attainments should take, but I would like to point out that it has always proceeded in New Zealand after D, on university lines, and I think that denotes a large conception in our Act that needs development. It shows that the whole education of our country was intended to be co-ordinated, and if you proceed in giving your highest certificates on university lines, eventually, in the course of a few years, I believe the grades of schools and the grades of men would correspond, and you would have the right men ready for schools to be changed into district high schools wherever required. I think secondary education will have to be met in some way like that.

437. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I take it you generally approve of the scale?—Certainly.

438. We were apt to think that Napier was the happy hunting-ground for teachers?—Napier might be, but Hawke's Bay is not.

439. You are still higher than some of the other education districts?—I did not say we were the lowest in the colony in the point of emolument; I said we were the worst off in the point of inequality in our scale.

440. Have you taken the amount paid in the Marlborough District?—I only took the five districts.

441. You should have said that yours was the worst scale in five-thirteenths of the school districts in New Zealand?—No; because I explained what I meant by worst—not actual salary, but actual salary compared with other salaries in the same district.

442. Do you consider that a third assistant female is equal to the first mistress in a school of 200?—No.

443. Do you not consider that the scale is inequitable to that extent?—Yes; but that was not in the scale I was referring to. That is in the scale that no one has seen.

444. If these two teachers get the same salary, do you think the scale is just?—No; I say the country ones should get more.

445. How much more?—It would be difficult to regulate that without looking into the salaries as a whole.

446. Perhaps £10 or £15 more?—Yes; there should be a distinction.

447. Do you believe in paying on the roll-number, or on the average as at present?—I believe in paying on the roll; the average is not an index of our work.

448. You are responsible for all that are on the roll?—Yes.

449. Do you think the work of a country teacher approaches that of a first assistant in a town school in value or responsibility?—I think the first assistant in a town school has a responsible position, and he ought to get a fair salary; but, considering the amount available for educational purposes, I think he should never get over £250 a year.

450. At what point in a country school would you give the same salary?—A school of 100.

451. If a woman teacher is qualified to teach 100 children, would you give her the same opportunity of securing a school at the same salary?—No; for the salary would be past the living-wage.

452. What difference would you make at that point?—Supposing a man got £200 for teaching that school, and a woman also got £200 for teaching it, the woman would be getting more than the man.

453. You say you would pay up to £250 for a male: what would you pay a female at that point?—About £180, or perhaps less. I am not sure that that is not too big. I believe that £180 is of more value to a woman than £250 to a man. Money is only of use to a person in the way it can satisfy his or her needs; and I say that a woman gets her needs better satisfied with £180 than does a man with £250—that is, on the average.

454. In the case of a woman having her parents to support, might she not then have the same responsibilities as a man?—No; for, in addition to his parents, the man might have a wife and family to support.

455. You would still retain openings in schools up to 100 for women to take headmistresships?—No, except under special circumstances.

456. What would the special circumstances be?—The training of girls.

457. You would not make the special circumstances the special qualifications of some women?—There are certainly some women capable; I believe that.

458. If some women are capable, is it not a wrong to them, because some are incapable, that you should debar them from these positions?—No, I do not think so.

459. Do you consider that women should be intrusted with the charge of the Fourth Fifth, and Sixth Standards in the large schools?—I believe the work is rather hard physically—I do not say mentally—for the average female.

460. Would you leave it in the hands of the head-teacher to say?—Yes, entirely.

461. You refer to the heavy charge of the Napier school as contrasted with that of Wellington: would you suggest that the scale of pay in a school like the Napier Main School should be on lines equal to that of Wellington?—No, I would not.

462. Do you not think that the teachers in the school in Wellington you quoted are wretchedly paid in the majority of instances?—I do not object to the pay of the pupil-teachers.

463. Not £20 a year for a pupil-teacher in the fourth year, and having charge of the Second or Third Standard?—Yes; but I am looking at the comparison with what others get.

464. The first assistant, £220?—Compared with the others, that is very good.

465. The second assistant, £150?—Yes; I am satisfied with that.

466. The third assistant, £125?—Yes. I think that scale is more equitable than ours, although I am not prepared to accept every point of it.

467. In point of salaries you would prefer Wellington to Hawke's Bay as a basis for the preparation of the scale?—On this principle: that it seems to give more to those holding responsible positions in comparison with those holding less responsible ones.

468. You have considered the Wellington scale?—Not in its minutiæ.

469. You consider that the lack of boys joining is not so much because of the scarcity of boys as owing to the fact that the prospects are not good?—Yes.

470. Do you consider that the colonial scale of staffs and salaries will relieve parochialism?—Yes.

471. Do you think it is essential that Inspectors should be placed under the department?—I think it would be a benefit to put Inspectors under central control in order that every district might get the benefit not of two or three Inspectors, but of all the Inspectors occasionally. I think that would be beneficial to education, and have a widening effect.

472. What functions do you think you would retain for the Board?—I am not prepared to answer that. I have an undeveloped theory of my own that something is needed to take the place of Committees and Boards altogether.

473. Do you not think that the discontent on the part of the teachers is owing to the lack of prospect of promotion?—Yes.

474. Do you think the country teachers, as a rule, are nearly as well considered as the town-school teachers in the rates of pay?—No.

475. And, if a vacancy occurs in a town school, does a country teacher have the same chance of getting it as a teacher in or near the town?—No.

476. Have you thought of a superannuation scheme at all?—I believe in the principle of it.

477. Do you think that out of the salaries contemplated teachers could afford, and would be willing to contribute, something towards a superannuation fund?—I do.

478. Have you too many schools in this district?—No.

479. Can you give us what you think should be the minimum wage paid to a man or woman in a school of, say, 20?—I think the lowest living-wage for a woman should not be less than £80.

480. You think that is sufficient for a woman going out into the back blocks?—No, I do not.

481. You would say £100, then?—Yes, if it is possible.

482. Do you not think she should get it?—Yes; but many people who are getting £300 should get £600 or £700.

483. If you are going to put ladies in these outlandish or ungodly places in the back blocks, do you not think they should get more than £80 a year?—I say, for a woman £90 at the very lowest.

484. And for a man would you make much difference?—No.

485. Say, just roughly, how long you would allow men and women's salaries to run parallel: up to £150?—No; I think I would make a differentiation after £120.

486. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—Twenty-three years.

487. What class of positions have you filled?—First as a pupil-teacher in a school of 300; then at the university for ten years, and during the whole of that time engaged in teaching, sometimes only private teaching, and in the summer months in schools—secondary and elementary; then the two years after that I spent entirely in university coaching; then I have been six years a schoolmaster in New Zealand.

488. In what class of schools have you taught in New Zealand?—I did a good amount of relieving-work. I have had experience only from 150 downwards.

489. What is the average attendance at your school at the present time?—100.

490. You have studied the suggested alternative scale?—Yes.

491. Did you notice that the first assistance suggested to be given is at 40, and that the suggested assistance is a fully qualified teacher: do you approve of that?—I think perhaps it is a little early to give a certificated assistant. I would like to see a scheme arranged under which it would be possible to transfer a pupil-teacher in the third year from a large school to complete her time in a school like that.

492. In schools from 36 to 50, would you be in favour of the assistance being in the form of a pupil-teacher who has had two years' experience in a large school?—Yes; I think it would be better to give assistance of some kind earlier than at 40.

493. Such assistance would not necessitate the alteration of the building?—No. For efficient teaching, even with 40 children and a pupil-teacher, I think two rooms are necessary.

494. Do you not think it is wise that the pupil-teacher should be under the direct supervision of the teacher?—No; I think that a pupil-teacher with some previous experience does better work very often if thrown on her or his own resources.

495. Would it not be too much to expect a pupil-teacher to teach and supervise efficiently the infants, Standards I. and II., with the headmaster not present?—I would not organize in that way.

496. How would you get over the difficulty, then?—The teacher would have to be guided very much by the ability, skill, and experience of the pupil-teacher, and would have to suit the conduct of the school to the condition of the pupil-teacher.

497. But I suppose you admit that a pupil-teacher who has been trained in a large school, and has been merely a class-teacher, or helping a class-teacher, could not go into such a school and take up the work of a room?—I admit that the average pupil-teacher could not do it.

498. It would be better, then, to have the average pupil-teacher in the room along with the head-teacher?—Yes, in many instances; although I believe that schools of that size would be the better, with two rooms for occasional use. There are circumstances in which both would be needed.

499. It would not be absolutely necessary that such schools should have two rooms?—No.

500. You noticed the change in the alternative scale where the pupil-teacher is proposed to be admitted?—At 90.

501. Do you think that is reasonable staffing?—Fairly reasonable.

502. Better than the staffing allowed in most educational districts?—Yes.

503. Much more liberal than Southland, and more liberal than Otago?—Yes.

504. I understood you to say that the salaries of head-teachers in schools of medium size were much lower in Hawke's Bay than in other districts, and much lower than the salaries suggested in this scale?—Yes.

505. I should like to prove what you say. Taking the school at Matawhero, I notice that the headmaster receives £181 13s.: is that the whole of his allowance?—Yes, counting the house. The average attendance is put down at 94; for that number he would get £165 6s. under our scale.

506. Under the suggested scale he would receive a salary of £212?—Yes.

507. Have you compared that salary with the salary paid for a school of a similar size in Otago, for instance?—Yes, but I do not remember the figures.

508. You will find that the Otago scale is very similar to the alternative scale?—Yes.

509. Take the school at Ormond—the average attendance is 76: could you tell me what is the salary, exclusive of house allowance?—The exact salary would be £157 per year.

510. And what would it be under the suggested scale?—£201.

511. Have you noticed that that suggested scale comes very closely to the scale at present paid in Wellington and Otago for the medium-sized class of schools?—Yes.

512. Do you contend that the alternative scale treats the country teachers in medium-sized schools much more fairly?—Yes.

513. And you approve of any scale that brings the salaries of the teachers of medium-sized schools in Hawke's Bay up to those paid in Wellington and Otago?—I do.

514. Did I understand you to say that you would approve of the classification of schools and positions whereby the minimum qualification for certain positions would be stated definitely, and that an applicant not possessing the minimum certificate would be ineligible?—Yes.

515. Have you noticed that such a scheme obtains at the present time in Otago?—I have not noticed that.

516. You have not noticed, for instance, that no teacher in Otago holding a lower certificate than C1 is eligible to apply for the position of headmaster of a district high school?—I knew of that instance.

517. What is your opinion as to the class of school that the average woman is capable of teaching?—Below 40.

518. You know that that is the rule of several Education Boards of the colony at the present time?—Yes.

519. In drawing up any scale, would you not approve of its being made elastic?—I do not think Education Boards or any one else should fix what a teacher has to do. I think a large school should be provided with a staff of such a kind that the male assistants would be available for all the higher standards if the headmaster wanted them.

520. Would you approve of such a proposal as this: that in fairly large schools the assistant after the infant mistress should be a male?—Yes.

521. *Mr. Stewart.*] Where was the first part of your experience gained?—In Scotland.

522. That was where you attended the university?—Yes.

523. Have you had any experience in Scotland of teaching classes of 60, 70, or 80 pupils?—I have had a class of 60, and it might have reached 70. I do not think any class that I was teaching reached 80.

524. Would it be considered a wise thing to have such large classes as 80?—I think it would be considered unwise.

525. If we have such large classes in our schools it should be met with a different method of staffing?—Yes; but I do not think it is possible with the money at the disposal of the Boards.

526. Do you not think, then, that it naturally follows that you want a very able type of man to teach these schools?—I do not think that is so. You need an able type of man to conduct a class of 80, of course. I have taught a class of 60 when I was a pupil-teacher.

527. Entirely by yourself?—Yes; I do not say it was a standard.

528. Do you not think, in schools with such large classes, the qualifications for maintaining discipline, keeping up the tone, and teaching children are somewhat rarely met with in a man?—Yes; but the same thing is applicable to all teaching experiences.

529. Do you think it is as easy to get a man to manage a school of 40 as it is to get a man to manage a class of 80 and maintain its discipline and tone?—I think it is more difficult to get a man to maintain a school of 40 than it would be to get a man to conduct a class of 60.

530. Do you think the difficulty with regard to these scales could be met by differential capitation, and leaving the Boards to draw up their own scales?—No, I do not think so.

531. Why not?—Because if a Board under these circumstances chose to draw up a scale for a school on a basis that could be proved to be uneducational, even although they spent no more money on the school itself, there would not be the same means of reforming that school under a provincial scale as under a colonial scale.

532. Would it not also be probable that the different Boards, in drawing up these scales, would create as great anomalies as exist at present?—I think that would be so.

533. Do you think that the Commission would be wise in framing a colonial scale without reference to house allowance?—I think it would be very unwise.

534. You are of opinion, I understand from that answer, that where there is no house a house allowance should be granted?—Yes.

535. *Mr. Luke.*] You talk about scholarships regulations being prepared by the Commissioners. School Commissioners, we take it, have charge of school reserves: did you mean School Committees or School Commissioners?—I meant School Commissioners, the men who have charge of school reserves. I referred to the appropriation of money towards the scholarships.

536. *Mr. Hill.*] You think that the scales which have been in operation in Hawke's Bay are not adapted to the present needs of this district?—No, though I believe they may have been in the past.

537. I understand you approve altogether of the adapting of circumstances to the needs of the several districts?—I hardly meant that.

538. Does it not follow that if you believe in adaptation in one way you should try and generalise it by adapting the various scales to the modifying and changing circumstances of the districts?—I believe that the experience of the thirteen Boards for the last twenty-three years is sufficient to enable us to draw up a scale that would meet the needs of the whole of New Zealand.

539. If you find that the proposed scale which has been submitted by the Inspector-General is not adaptive, or does not harmonize with experience, which would you take?—The proposed scale has, I understand, been drawn up by experts, with all the experience before them of the thirteen Boards since the initiation of the Education Act.

540. And if the experience of those experts does not agree with the results as shown by the Education Boards, what then would you suggest: would you agree with the experience of the experts in preference to the experience of the Boards?—Yes.

541. They must have based it on some knowledge of the needs of the education districts?—Yes.

542. You gave us the cost of education in the largest schools in Hawke's Bay, Wellington, Otago, Auckland, and Christchurch. You itemised these, and then told us that the proposed amended scale would give to these schools £2 6s. 1d.: do you know what the average cost of these schools is that you mention?—No.

543. Are you aware that the proposed scale gives £2 6s. 1d., and the average of the others is £2 10s., and therefore in the district the average for these five which you have given is almost as much below the Hawke's Bay scale as the Hawke's Bay scale is above the others? Do you think there is any more reason to doubt the one than there is the other, if right? Do you think the £2 6s. 1d. is likely to produce more efficiency? You know the efficiency of the Main School in Napier: can you guarantee that £2 6s. 1d. will supply more or equal efficiency?—Considering the amount of salaries that is allowed by that £2 6s. 1d., and staffing, I say Yes.

544. You think that—the same standard of efficiency on the £2 6s. 1d. basis—notwithstanding that after the experience of twenty-three years the various Education Boards in New Zealand show that it costs about £2 10s. on the average?—Yes.

545. You object to the cost of the Napier school?—No; I object to the cost of it in comparison with what is spent on other schools.

546. I understood you to say that the first assistant would never get more than £250?—I said he should never get more than £250 when we have a capitation of £4.

547. You said that the salary of a first assistant should never be more than £250, and that the headmaster of a school of 100 should get a salary equal to that?—Yes.

548. Therefore you do not think that the teachers should get the salaries at present paid?—Yes.

549. You want to reduce town teachers to increase the salaries of country teachers?—That is the principle I want recognised, but I do not want them reduced in order that country teachers may get more.

550. You said in your statement that the headmaster in a school of 100 should be equal to the first assistant in such a school?—Yes; I say that is the principle I wish to see followed out—that the first assistant should rank equal to the headmaster of a school of 100.

551. In order to do this you would bring down the salary of the first assistant to what you think ought to be paid to the master of a school of 100?—Or bring the master of the country school up to the level of the first assistant.

552. Or equalise them?—Yes.

553. You have an assistant mistress in your school?—Yes.

554. How many children is she responsible for under you?—This year she is responsible for 37, and in addition to that she is responsible for the sewing of all the girls in the school, and also, I may say, she is responsible with me for the general conduct of the girls that she does not teach.

555. How many more pupils have you to control than she has?—Some years we may be equal; this year I have about 50. There are 26 besides that are under a pupil-teacher, and I have to control that pupil-teacher.

556. What is the salary of your infant mistress?—£89 10s.
557. What is her classification?—So far as I know, E3 or E4.
558. Do you think that a mistress who is responsible for 30 or 40 children in a small country school should receive the same salary as a woman who is a specialised teacher in a large school?—I would give her more.
559. When a teacher is appointed as a class-teacher, she or he has a certificate: does that certificate imply generalised training or does it not?—It implies generalised training.
560. Does it imply that a teacher has learned how to take charge of a school?—I do not think our certificates would really involve that.
561. Does the certificate imply specialised capacity or generalised capacity?—Generalised capacity perhaps, so far as it implies any capacity at all.
562. When a teacher is appointed, say, to become a class-teacher in the Napier school, does the practice in that large school give generalised capacity or specialised capacity?—I think you misunderstood what I meant when I said generalised. I meant by that that it involved the capacity to a certain extent of doing anything that is required in a school.
563. That is, to take charge of an elementary school: that is why the certificate is issued, you will recognise that?—Yes.
564. When a teacher is in charge of a class it not only implies position generalised, but also position specialised. Now, I am going to ask you, as a special coach for teaching, does the specialised knowledge which you have in that matter give you an advantage over the generalised man—the man with general knowledge, but without experience: is it to your advantage or is it not?—All special experience is to a man's advantage.
565. You think that specialised knowledge should be paid for?—Yes; but I do not admit that the ability to teach a class in a school shows more special knowledge than it does to conduct a smaller school.
566. As to the training of teachers, what do you think: is it a wise course to take a Sixth Standard pupil straight away as a pupil-teacher?—I think it is madness to take a pupil straight from the Sixth Standard.
567. Would you suggest some plan whereby a pupil is trained in the art of school methods?—I think mental preparation is the first preparation necessary.
568. Would you then suggest their going into a school before receiving training in the art of school-work?—I think that to come into the school after matriculation would be a very good way of starting the training.
569. Do you not think it is better to undergo some kind of training in method before coming into the school?—That would be a more ideal method.
570. You do not believe in the plan of classifying teachers as at present?—I believe in some of the principles of it; but it is too complex. I believe that A and B ought to be abolished altogether.
571. Of course, literary training is essential to a teacher's life?—Yes.
572. Then, you would suggest that simply a certificate should be issued?—Yes.
573. Would you suggest that it should be made into three divisions, typifying entrance into the teaching profession, growing in the teaching profession, and the highest scale attained in the teaching profession?—Yes; but I would like to see recognition made of the literary advancement of the teacher, as well as his experience.
574. Do you not think that a man who loves his profession is always learning and educating himself?—Precisely.
575. How would you measure that preparation?—Only by examination.
576. You approve of a colonial scale?—I do.
577. Do you approve of the scale which has been suggested?—Generally, I do.
578. Do you think that the stereotyping of all the schools, varying as they do throughout this colony, could be carried out efficiently?—I do not think that is stereotyping the teachers.
579. Do not the conditions vary throughout New Zealand?—Not much.
580. Sometimes it is necessary to have a modification of the staffing in a school?—Not in a school of the same size. I think, however, that there should be provision for special schools.
581. Should the central authority have power to modify, or should that power be left with the Education Board?—I do not think we could trust the local authority.
582. You could trust the central authority?—In this way: the local authority might go on multiplying expense which would be useful in itself, but which the country could not stand.
583. If you take away the control of the salaries, staffing, and everything, except the small sum of 11s. 3d. for distribution among the Committees, what is the good of Education Boards at all?—I do not know.
584. *Mr. Smith.*] How long have you been in this district?—Seven years.
585. You say you represent the whole of the teachers in the Hawke's Bay District, male and female?—I was appointed to do so.
586. How many members are there belonging to the Institute?—About sixty.
587. Was the meeting at which you were appointed properly called?—Yes.
588. How many were present?—Thirty; which is the largest meeting of the Institute ever held in Hawke's Bay.
589. Was any one else nominated?—Another teacher was appointed to act with me.
590. What certificate do you hold?—B2.
591. *Mr. Weston.*] I think I understood you to say that you considered the allowance under the present and proposed scale alike inadequate?—No, I did not say that.
592. You agree with the proposed scale of staff in all its essentials?—Yes, generally I do; I think it is on a very sound basis.

593. Do you think that the circumstances of the colony might presently change, so as to require a revision of the scale, both in regard to staffs and salaries?—The circumstances of the colony might change in such a way that all the salaries should be increased or diminished, according to the welfare of the country; but if we had a fixed scale everything would be done equally, and there would be no disproportion between one or the other.

594. You do not think the circumstances of the various districts are such as to render necessary either a reduced or increased staff of teachers?—No, I think not; unless under special circumstances, where it was found necessary to train teachers, or have district high schools.

595. You think there may be special circumstances?—Yes.

596. Do you or do you not consider that Boards of Education would deal with such contingencies better than the General Government?—I believe that those matters might be dealt with by Boards, but they should be dealt with apart from the question of a colonial scale of staffing in our ordinary schools.

597. You think that all these circumstances might be considered, and yet we could have a colonial scale of staff?—Yes.

598. With regard to pupil-teachers, do you think that pupil-teachers in your country schools in this district receive sufficient and efficient education?—They do not.

599. In what respect should an improvement be effected?—It should be generally made in the direction of giving them means for mental training, and also in the direction of training them as teachers.

600. Do you think that pupil-teachers' time should be divided in school-hours between teaching and study?—Yes, so long as there is a pupil-teacher system in existence.

601. Do you think that the pupil-teachers trained in our country schools in this district can hereafter expect to stand side by side with children educated subsequent to their pupil-teacher's career in the training-schools of Otago and North Canterbury?—My experience of teachers whom I have known to be trained in Hawke's Bay leads me to say that they are quite on a par with any teachers I have seen in the other districts.

602. What becomes, then, of your argument just now, that they should have more mental training?—I do not mean our pupil-teachers alone; I mean all teachers.

603. You think that the pupil-teachers throughout the colony are deficient in education?—Those who have only gone through the pupil-teacher course.

604. You are evading the question as to whether pupil-teachers trained in our country schools in this district can hereafter expect to stand side by side with children educated, subsequent to their pupil-teachers' career, in the training-schools of Otago and North Canterbury?—The pupil-teachers of this district who have pushed on in the profession have, under great difficulties, taken means to get the training.

605. What means have they resorted to?—They have resorted to paying for it in a great many cases—attending classes; they, of course, receive tuition from the headmasters.

606. What classes do they attend at the present time?—In this town there are pupil-teachers paying fees to—I think—Mr. Gray. I had classes here myself last year, which pupil-teachers attended.

607. I understand, then, from your answer, you must differentiate between people who can afford to pay for tuition and those who cannot afford to pay?—Yes.

608. If you differentiate between those who can and those who cannot afford to pay for tuition, how is this colonial scale of staff to operate in regard to children who have the advantage of money, in order to be properly trained?—The colonial scale of staff only makes provision for teaching in the schools. It makes no provision for training teachers.

609. Quite true, but what I want to get at is this: under existing circumstances, will all the teachers stand on an equal footing to render a scale of staff, and salaries fair, equitable, and righteous between all the teachers of the colony?—I do not admit that they will stand on an equal footing, because there comes the question of classification. Teachers have to get certificates, and certificates involve work.

610. Is it fair, then, to expect teachers in small country schools to be able to obtain good certificates, and, if they cannot obtain them by reason of circumstances, are they to be cast out and receive no employment?—They are not cast out; I differ from you. In New Zealand I do not believe in making things too easy. I say that any young man or any young woman of grit in New Zealand, if they wish to get good opportunities for training themselves, they can find them.

611. How can pupil-teachers in the country schools, without means, expect to secure all the advantages that young men and women in more favourable circumstances are able to secure?—They are not quite so favourably situated, I know.

612. You think that, notwithstanding these matters I have just referred to, a colonial scale of staff and salaries would work fairly, equitably, and righteously throughout the colony?—Yes, I do.

613. Do you think that the management of our schools should remain in the hands of Boards, or would you recommend the abolition of Boards and place everything under the control of the central department in Wellington?—No; I have not studied that question.

614. What do you think in regard to the matter of the removal and promotion of teachers, should be done?—I do not think the conditions at present existing in regard to those matters are satisfactory.

615. And the appointment of teachers also?—Yes.

616. What would you recommend to meet those conditions?—If you had asked me that question a year ago I think I would have said the Board should have the control in the matter of appointment; in fact, I still believe they should have the power of promotion. But I have changed my mind considerably in regard to that point lately, and I think, though they should have the

power of promotion, in no case should that power be exercised without the concurrence and opinions of the Inspectors.

617. Then, you think that the appointments and promotion of teachers should be left with the Boards and Inspectors?—Yes, I think so.

618. Do you approve of the removal of teachers from one school to another when circumstances warrant it?—Yes.

619. How would you effect it?—If the Board, with advice of skilled assistance—of Inspectors—comes to the conclusion that it is for the benefit of education that such changes should be made, they should have the right to make them.

620. Would that not amount to the appointment of teachers being left to the Boards?—Yes; the Boards acting with the Inspectors.

621. You would disregard the Committees altogether?—Not altogether.

622. How would you qualify it?—I would consult Committees, according to the Act, to this extent: that they might state any objection they had to an appointment being made, and that such objection should be considered by the Board.

623. Supposing John Brown, a teacher, does not give satisfaction to a Committee, or has been guilty of some little fault in the conduct of his school which might render a change necessary, and the Board decides to remove him to another school, and to exchange the teachers without the sanction of both Committees: would you recommend that course?—I see great difficulties in a case of that sort.

624. What would you advise me on the point I am now consulting you on?—I think the difficulty would be removed a good deal by fixing a very rigid definition of the duties of Committees.

625. I do not think that is an answer. I want to know what you would do in the matter?—I think the Board should try to meet the Committees in the matter of consultation as far as possible, and if unable to agree the Board should have its own way.

626. You mean the Board should be practically supreme in the appointment of teachers?—Yes.

627. And a Committee should have thrust upon them a teacher, who has, perhaps, been removed from another school in disgrace?—I take it no Board would do anything of that kind, acting on the advice of the Inspector.

628. What do you think of teaching the sexes together in the same standards?—I believe in it.

629. What is your opinion in regard to sick pay and a compassionate allowance?—This Board has been very liberal in that matter, and I think the general principle should be the principle adopted by this Board, which I think is a very fair one, although I cannot give you the exact details.

630. What would you think would be a fair allowance for sick teachers, and a fair compassionate allowance to representatives of deceased teachers?—I cannot see how a compassionate allowance would work; I do not think it could be done very well.

631. Do you think that a man, after serving perhaps twenty years under a Board, and who died in the service of the Board, that his widow and family should not receive any compassionate allowance?—I could not propose any such scheme, though I do not say they should not get a compassionate allowance.

632. Supposing a teacher has been in your service ten years, and then falls ill—perhaps the illness terminates fatally—what consideration do you think the Board should show, and for the purposes of this question we will assume that there are relieving-teachers to take the duties of the sick man off his hands?—I think, in a case of illness of a teacher, the teacher ought to get at least three months' leave of absence on full pay.

633. Have all these points that you have addressed us upon so very ably been considered carefully by the Institute you represent?—Yes, I think so.

634. Was there unanimity in the conclusions they arrived at on the various points?—The main point of the statement I have put before the Commission. When I put that statement in, favouring the position of country teachers as against assistants, it was carried by a majority, though there was not complete unanimity.

635. A majority of how many?—By a majority of one; but it was at a meeting where we could only get a very small representation of country teachers. The meeting was held in Napier, and the country teachers were not able to attend.

636. Is it, in your opinion, the fact that the views you have enunciated and laid before us are the views of all?—The views of the great majority of Hawke's Bay teachers.

637. Assuming the Board was placed in possession of funds to enable it to deal fairly and properly with the teachers, and assuming also that a fair and equitable scale of salaries were framed, would you still need a colonial scale?—I do not think a proper scale is possible without a colonial scale. I think the only means of removing the difficulty is to get a colonial scale.

638. You think that the members of the Commission are more capable of drawing up a colonial scale than any one Board composed of nine men; that, I think, is the point?—I do not think it is the point myself.

639. If you accepted our scale, drawn up by ten men, or the Board's scale, drawn up by nine men, where is the difference?—A colonial scale equalises the conditions for the whole of New Zealand, and puts the expense of education on an equitable basis, while it also provides more elasticity for changes, if they are found necessary.

640. Do you think there would be no elasticity in a scale framed by Boards?—I believe, conscientiously, that the principles of our scale could not possibly be changed—under our parochial system.

641. *The Chairman.*] Do you think the system of primary education in this district is satisfactory and efficient?—I think it is quite as efficient as in any other district in New Zealand.

642. You believe the salaries in this district are in many instances inadequate?—Yes.

643. Do you believe they are generally inadequate, or that special salaries need building up?—Special salaries need building up.

644. What salaries are those that need building up?—The salaries of sole teachers of schools ranging from the bottom of the scale up to schools of 200 or 300 in attendance, and also the salaries of first assistant mistresses.

645. What is the amount paid to a headmaster in this district of a school of about 300 in attendance?—£284.

646. What is your opinion in regard to that salary?—I think it is fairly adequate.

647. There is a house provided as well?—Yes.

648. So that that salary really represents over £300?—Yes,

648A. Do you think it is an adequate salary?—Yes, as things go.

649. You think there should be a difference in the salaries of male and female teachers, after they reach £120 a year?—Yes.

650. Can you give us any idea what the percentage of difference should be: whether it should be on a progressive scale?—I think on a progressive scale; that the percentage should start low, and gradually increase.

651. I think you mentioned that a woman could manage to live on £180 a year as well as a man could on £250 a year; will you explain to my satisfaction what you mean by that?—I mean that salaries are of value to the person just in proportion as they enable the person to satisfy his or her needs; and I think any woman, under our present social system in New Zealand, could satisfy her needs and aspirations more adequately on a salary of £180 than what a man could satisfy his on a salary of £250.

652. Will you inform us what those needs and aspirations are; I want you to define them?—Well, a woman with a salary of £180 a year, if her aim is to save money and provide for old age, or save money and, we will say, go travelling, could save a good deal beyond the cost of living; but a man would not be able to do so on a salary of £180; he has to fulfil his position as a man, must be allowed the means of having a wife, and fulfilling his duties as a member of the State. After providing for a wife and family he would not have much for himself.

653. Must he necessarily have a family?—He must be in a position to provide for one, at all events.

654. If he has a not a family is he a bad subject?—Not necessarily.

655. Does he fulfil his duties to the State, supposing he gets married, and has no family?—Yes, I think so. I do not say it is the duty of every married man to have a family.

656. If he wishes to provide for his old age, is there any necessity for him to get married at all?—There is a necessity to make it possible for him to get married.

657. I want to know where you draw the difference between single men and single women with regard to salary?—I mean to say that our social conditions in this world recognise this difference between the sexes. Our social condition is such that it will be against nature if we do not take into account that provision must be made for the comfortable living of a man, in order that he may have the means to provide for a wife, if he wants one, and a family, should there be one.

658. Do you know whether that phase of the question is generally taken into consideration by employers?—It certainly settles the rate of wages everywhere, and in every kind of employment. Women teachers in New Zealand, for example, are far better paid in comparison with women employed in other walks of life, while male teachers receive less than men in most positions.

659. Do you think one wrong justifies another?—It is not a wrong.

660. But assuming it is?—I have only this to say: People are inspired to work, and inspired to look for positions in order to satisfy their needs; and if women's needs are more cheaply satisfied than men's, then, I think, women get salaries equal to men, even though they are paid less—what I mean to say is, they get an equal value.

661. You think a male teacher is not fully equipped or completed for life until he is a married man with a family?—I did not say anything of the kind.

662. What would you do with bachelor teachers: would you pay them women's wages?—No.

663. Would you pay them the same wages as you would pay to married men?—Yes.

664. Why?—If you are going to mulct teachers in that way, you must do the same thing in other professions.

665. Do you think there should be a special scale for married male teachers and a special scale for unmarried teachers?—No.

666. Then, why do you advocate giving a man 50 per cent. more salary than a woman?—Well, I can only say because a man is a man and a woman is a woman.

667. If you go into an outfitter's shop, do you ask whether the article you wish to purchase is made by female labour or not?—No; but I know if I purchase an article made by female labour it does not cost so much.

668. Do you not think when a man is married he should pay for the privilege—for a home, and wife to sew on his buttons and cook his meals?—Yes, so he does.

669. Then why would you ask the State to make special provision for married men simply because they are performing their duties to the State?—I do not ask that.

670. You say you know of females being appointed to schools of over 40 in attendance?—Yes.

671. Have you heard of any female teachers, since you have been in this district, being appointed to schools with an average attendance of something like 80—schools that were previously in charge of male teachers?—No, I have not.

J. A. SMITH, B.A., Head Master of the Hastings School, examined.

Mr. Smith: I may say that I was elected by the Hawke's Bay Branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute to lay before you resolutions which were passed at a meeting at which myself and my colleague were elected. The resolutions were as follows:—(1.) The Institute affirmed the desirability of a colonial scale. (2.) They approved the scale submitted, with certain exceptions. (3.) They are of opinion that schools should be graded as well as teachers. I do not propose to offer you any opinions of my own, but shall confine myself to these points, and submit to examination.

672. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you agree with what Mr. Watson stated in evidence?—I certainly do not.

673. Why do you not?—As I have not the whole list of his contentions, I cannot speak from memory.

674. Generally, you believe in the alternative scale of salaries that has been submitted by the Inspector-General?—Yes, but I disagree with the proposal to have ladies in charge of the upper standards in large schools—that is, in charge of standards higher than Standard III., for I do not think they are physically fitted for the work.

675. Would you not place the power in the hands of the head-teacher to say whether they are fitted or not?—I do not know that I would.

676. Do not some female teachers do excellent work in the standards?—Yes, but they kill themselves over it.

677. Are there not some women physically strong enough to take charge of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards?—Not for any length of time. I have never seen, in all the years that I have been headmaster, a woman who could take charge of Standard IV.

678. Have you had any experience in South Canterbury or in Otago?—No.

679. Are you aware that women have done the work of the upper standards for years?—Yes.

680. And are you aware that they are still strong and robust women?—I am not aware of that.

681. What size country school would you allow a woman to be headmistress of?—A school with an attendance up to 40 or 45.

682. At what point do you consider the first assistant in a large school and the head-teacher in a country school should be paid the same salary?—The second master of a school like the Napier Boys' School is virtually equal to the headmaster of a country school. I should say the first assistant in a school of 200 should receive the same salary as the headmaster of a country school.

683. What is your opinion in regard to promotion?—When a teacher desires promotion he should apply for positions in such schools as he thinks will be promotion if he gets the appointment.

684. Do you believe in the system of promotion obtaining at present?—Not exactly. I think most Boards interpret the word "consult" too liberally. I do approve of submitting more than one name to a Committee, and if the Committee can give good reasons for the non-appointment of that teacher, another name should be sent in. I strongly disapprove of the Committees making appointments.

685. Do you think that the dissatisfaction existing in the teaching profession at the present time is solely due to the manner in which the funds have been handled by the Education Boards?—No doubt that has a good deal to do with it.

686. And in the matter of promotions also?—Yes.

687. Do you think the central authority would give greater satisfaction with the same money at their disposal?—I cannot say.

688. Are you in favour of Inspectors being under the control of a central department, or being officers of Education Boards?—They should be officers of Boards in so far as their special knowledge and experience should be at the service of the Boards. Otherwise they should be under the control of the central department.

689. The central department should have the power to transfer them from one district to another?—Yes.

690. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you in favour of the colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

691. Do you think that it would further educational progress if, instead of thirteen different scales existing in the colony at the present time, we had a uniform scale for the colony?—Yes.

692. Apart altogether from teachers and their salaries, you think that it would be an educational advantage?—Yes, I do.

693. Do you consider where positions are suitable for women, in schools up to an attendance of 40, they should have the opportunity of filling those positions?—Yes.

694. That is to say, out of 1,675 schools, 1,040, or 62 per cent. of the schools, should be thrown open to women?—Yes.

695. Would you pay, in those schools, the same salaries to both men and women?—Yes.

696. Up to 40 in average attendance?—Yes; or up to a salary of, I should say, £100 a year, I should equalise the payments to men and women. As a matter of fact, a man is only beginning life at that stage, and his salary is not of much account.

697. You mean to say that salaries of males and females up to £100 should be equal?—Yes, or thereabouts.

698. Above that you would differentiate in the salaries for the sexes?—Yes.

699. Whether they were doing equal work or not?—Yes.

700. You consider up to £100 a living wage?—Yes.

701. Suppose, as you will find in the alternative scale, that the salary reaches £100 when the average attendance of a school reaches 19, would you pay the sexes equally there?—Yes.

702. After that you would differentiate?—Yes.

703. Do you not think that it would be better for women themselves that there should be a differentiation?—Yes; I think it would be to their advantage. Otherwise they would bring into competition with them a greater number of males.

704. You think if the salaries were equal to both men and women above £100 and the positions were thrown open for competition to the sexes, women would possibly be pushed out of the positions they now occupy?—Yes; that is my opinion.

705. While you do not wish to equalise the salaries of male and female teachers, you would, as far as possible, reduce the disparity?—Yes; that is so.

706. After a salary of £100 had been reached you would make a distinction in the salaries attached to schools having an average attendance up to 40 pupils?—Yes.

707. Do I understand you to say that in large schools, where the Fourth Standard is a heavy one, you think the average woman is physically incapable of managing that standard?—Yes, I am perfectly sure she is.

708. In the small schools, where the standard classes are not so large, a woman might take Standard IV. very well, might she not?—Yes; but it is not altogether the work of the standard. I do not think a woman capable of maintaining the same discipline as a male, and I say the physical strain is altogether too much for her. It is a very extraordinary woman who can manage such a class for one year.

709. Would you not allow some elasticity in drawing up a scale, so that exceptional women might have opportunities of filling such positions if it were thought wise to allow them?—I have already said I do not believe in it. I do not wish to stand in the way of exceptional women being paid fair salaries, but I do not change my opinion in regard to their ability to manage upper standards.

710. You will notice that in schools between 50 and 150 in attendance the salaries attached to that class of schools in Hawke's Bay are lower than in several districts of the colony: do you think these medium-sized schools have too low salaries attached to them?—Yes, I do.

711. You think that the proposed salaries under the alternative scale are fairer than those at at present obtaining in Hawke's Bay?—Yes; I thought the head-teachers were getting a rise at the expense of assistants, and I was disposed to oppose the scale, but I have since learned that it is not so. I think the assistants a most deserving class of teachers, and also the head-teachers of the medium-sized schools, and I am of the opinion that they should receive consideration.

712. *Mr. Stewart.*] You are in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.

713. That implies that you do not agree with the anomalies that at present prevail throughout New Zealand in regard to the teaching profession?—That is so.

714. Do you think there is any other method of dealing with these anomalies other than by a colonial scale?—I cannot think of any other method, though I have not given the matter much thought.

715. It has been suggested that if a differentiated capitation were given Education Boards might frame for themselves a scale which would meet the difficulties at present existing?—Yes, but we should still have thirteen different scales.

716. And consequently, you think, thirteen systems containing anomalies?—Yes.

717. I believe you have been in charge of a large school for some years?—Yes.

718. What is your experience in regard to getting suitable male assistants for responsible positions under you?—I have never had any difficulty in getting suitable male assistants.

719. Which do you think the rarer quality—an assistant teacher capable of managing a large class, or an efficient teacher of a medium-sized school of 45 or 50 in average attendance?—I cannot answer the question, for I have not had any experience in small schools.

720. You would object to giving a woman charge of a large class of 80 or 90 pupils?—Yes.

721. Do you think any teacher, a male or a female, should be put to teach 80 or 90 pupils?—No, I do not.

722. Do you think that any attempt on the part of a teacher to teach 80 or 90 children results in an educational loss to the children, in there being so many in charge of one teacher?—A skilful teacher, with the assistance of a pupil-teacher, in a class of 80 or 90, would be able to make good use of that pupil-teacher, and so obtain good results.

723. Do you think that a male teacher, with the assistance of a pupil-teacher, could really develop the educational powers of 80 or 90 children?—Yes, certainly; though, of course, not so well as if that teacher had only 30 pupils.

724. Then, the State ought to aim at the smaller number being given to the individual teacher?—Yes.

725. Have you any experience as to the comparative length of time in each year that male and female teachers are absent from their duties through sickness?—Women are absent considerably more than men.

726. Your argument, of course, is that a woman is not worth so much as a man?—Yes; it is upon that point that I base my arguments.

727. Do you not think it is sometimes wise for a woman teacher to be put in charge of a large class for a year, say: would it do her any harm?—It might not do her any harm, but it would possibly do the class harm.

728. You think that necessarily follows?—Yes.

729. Does it not sometimes arise in a large school, where you may want a male teacher to do other work, that you have to take him from his work in the upper standards, and you have no other alternative than to place a woman—for the time being, at any rate—in his place?—Yes.

730. You would not tie the hands of the headmaster in the disposal of his staff?—No; I do not see how you could tie his hands.

731. You recognise that such a principle as to tie the hands of a master in the matter of the disposal of his staff would be an extremely bad one?—Yes.

732. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider that if a colonial scale of salaries is adopted it should take effect, in respect to the salaries of teachers, immediately or by a gradual process, such as when vacancies occur?—Immediately, I think, if it could be done without upsetting the finances.

733. Have you estimated how many teachers would be prejudicially affected in the Hawke's Bay District by the introduction of such a scale?—No, I have not.

734. Are you aware that the great majority of your teachers would benefit, and that very few would be prejudicially affected, by the introduction of this scale?—Yes.

735. With regard to the payment of salaries, do you consider payments should be based on average attendance or on the roll-number?—As far as my experience goes, I should say on average attendance.

736. Have the teachers in this district expressed any opinion otherwise?—No, not to my knowledge.

737. Have they expressed any opinion as to paying on the attendance for the previous quarter or the previous four quarters?—No.

738. What is your opinion as to the working-average of 20 per cent.: do you think it is satisfactory?—The teachers have not expressed any opinion upon it. I think generally they are satisfied with the present system.

739. Do you find that the working-average gives any appreciable relief in this district; and are there many days on which the attendance is less than one-half?—In my own school it does not make much difference. How it affects bush districts I am not prepared to say, but I fancy it would give considerable relief.

740. With regard to the minimum certificates in the proposed scale, do you consider they are too high?—Yes, in some cases.

741. Where would you consider reduction should be made: do you think it should be in the small schools of 14 to 19 in average attendance?—Yes, in the schools carrying the smaller salaries. I think the salaries are low enough without penalising them.

742. You do not favour the reduction of salaries when the minimum certificate is not held?—No, I do not. That was one of the principles I was sent here to approve of—"that position should be paid, and not the teacher."

743. Was any opinion expressed with regard to the proposed reduction of £10 for a sewing-mistress?—Yes.

744. What opinion was expressed?—I received no instruction on the matter, but the general opinion was that the reduction should not be made.

745. Then, it was considered that the appointment of a sewing-mistress is no assistance to a teacher at all?—No.

746. With regard to the work done in town schools and country schools, do you believe in a differentiation of the syllabus for the work required in a small country school and a town school?—Yes; I think the country school should receive some consideration.

747. You do not consider that a lower standard should be expected in the country school in regard to pass-subjects?—No. Other branches might be dealt with a little more leniently.

748. Would a proposal to give a teacher a few alternative subjects as class-subjects in country schools meet with your approval?—Yes.

749. Do you find that teachers in this district when applying for positions in other districts are boycotted?—Yes; they are boycotted absolutely.

750. I suppose this Board retaliates?—This Board did not until recently. We had to educate it up to retaliation.

751. Do you consider that the adoption of a colonial scale, and possibly a regulation making provision for the transfer of teachers from one education district to another, will do away with the parochial system that has grown up?—I really do not know whether it will or whether it will not. I think the thing has become part and parcel of our system, and that it will take a lot of weeding-out.

752. With regard to scholarships, do you understand how it comes about that the School Commissioners have to do with scholarships?—I do not know anything about the matter. They control certain funds which are devoted to scholarships; that is all I know.

753. They do not hand it over to the Board?—No; as far as I understand from Dr. Sidey, it is not so.

754. Do you consider that the salaries of teachers should be increased by units or by grades?—By units.

755. Is that the system in Hawke's Bay?—Yes.

756. Are you in favour of a superannuation scheme or retiring-allowance for teachers?—Yes, I am very much in favour of it. I wish I could see where it was coming from.

757. Do you consider that there are too many pupil-teachers in the service of this Board?—Yes, I do.

758. I suppose you have looked through the Minister's report, which contains the salaries and staffing of schools in the education districts of the colony?—Yes.

759. Do you consider that, taken as a whole, there are too many pupil-teachers employed by the various Boards?—Yes.

760. In looking at the suggested scheme you will see that there are not so many pupil-teachers proposed?—That is so.

761. You have seven pupil-teachers?—Yes.

762. According to the suggested scale, you would only have five pupil-teachers?—Yes.

763. Do you consider that the suggested salaries proposed to be paid to pupil-teachers are sufficient?—I think so. I do not think the pupil-teacher looks so much at the commencing salary as at the prospects open to him when he has completed his term of apprenticeship.

764. With regard to the Board allowance for pupil-teachers when they are away from home, do you consider it is ample?—I have not gone into that question.

765. Do you consider that the provision made in this district for the training of ex-pupil-teachers is a good one?—Yes, I think it is an excellent one.

766. Do you favour the establishment of a training-college in the four chief centres, and also making provision for training institutions such as you have in the smaller centres?—Yes; there should be training institutions for pupil-teachers to go to. We lose good teachers through their going into training-colleges in other centres, and never coming back.

767. Do you consider that the head-teachers should be paid for instruction to pupil-teachers?—Yes, I do.

768. How many hours a day should pupil-teachers for the first year be employed in actual teaching in the schools?—We have employed them for the full hours.

769. By regulation?—Yes, by regulation. The matter for study is one for themselves.

770. Would you favour the substitution of an assistant teacher, where practicable, for two pupil-teachers in a large school?—Yes; I would sooner have an assistant than two pupil-teachers, any time.

771. Would the adoption of a colonial scale like the suggested one interfere very much with the staff of the schools in this district; and will it necessitate additions to the buildings that are already established, or partitioning any of the rooms in those school-buildings?—I do not think so. I do not think it will render additions or partitions necessary.

772. Do you consider the adoption of a colonial scale will in any way minimise the power and influence of Education Boards?—No, I do not.

773. *Mr. Hill.*] I understand you to say you agree with the principle of a colonial scale?—Yes, with the principle of it.

774. You have considered this proposed colonial scale?—Yes.

775. Do you agree with the suggestions proposed in it?—Not all of them. There are several I differ from.

776. Would you explain in what way?—In the first place, the appointment of a certificated assistant, a mistress, is the first addition to the staff in the amended scale when the attendance reaches 40 to 65.

777. You object to that?—Yes.

778. Why?—Because I think a pupil-teacher who has had a couple of years' or three years' training in a large school would, when transferred to a school with an attendance of from 40 to 65, receive very valuable experience at that school before going to a training-college, and would do as good work as a certificated mistress. I do not think a certificated mistress necessary.

779. You think a good deal of money might be saved by that system of classification?—Yes—a system by which pupil-teachers who have had two years in a large school should be transferred to one of these smaller schools before entering a training-college.

780. What salary would you suggest should be paid to that pupil-teacher living away from home—say, a third-year pupil-teacher?—From £60 to £70—the salary that the Board now pays those teachers who are sent as relieving-teachers. They find the salary the Board provides is ample.

781. What other objection have you to the scale?—I was of the opinion that the country schools were being overstaffed at the expense of assistantships in large schools, but I have been informed an amendment is in progress that will alter that.

782. You are aware that we have no evidence as to assistance or anything else in the amended scale after the attendance reaches 330?—Yes; I take it that after that it comes back to the original scale.

783. You approve of the staffing as set forth in the original scale?—Yes.

784. What is the average attendance at your school?—536.

785. I mean for the past year?—Anything from 500 to 550.

786. How many assistants have you at your school?—Five.

787. Under the proposed scale how many would you get?—Seven. I have five now, as I said, and seven pupil-teachers.

788. Your staffing, then, would be increased by the proposed scale?—Yes.

789. Have you estimated the salaries your assistants would get under the scale?—Yes; I have noticed the salaries that are set forth in the scale.

790. Are you satisfied they would be well paid?—Yes.

791. What does your first assistant receive at the present time?—£235.

792. What will he get under the proposed scale?—I cannot say; I understand these scales do not apply now.

793. What does your second assistant receive in way of salary from the Board?—£130.

794. Do you think that your school will be as well staffed?—No, I certainly do not, assuming that the salaries are greatly interfered with.

795. Do you think your school will be as efficiently staffed as it is now if the salaries under the proposed scale obtain?—No.

796. Have you any other objection to the proposed scale?—No.

797. Do you approve of the principle of classification as set forth in the proposed scale?—I do not approve of the principle of a teacher being penalised for not holding a sufficiently high certificate.

798. Do you approve of the present classification of teachers?—No; I think it is too cumbersome.

799. Do you think it is necessary in a colonial scheme of payment of salaries?—Yes, I think so, in the matter of making appointments.

800. Does it follow that because a man holds a D1 certificate he is better than a man holding a D2 certificate?—Yes, I think so.

801. You think D2 men inferior to D1 men in every way?—Yes, in ninety cases out of a hundred.

802. You think that in placing a requirement for a position it should be insisted upon?—I do not think that it follows. I say that the certificate should be retained as a guide to the appointing body.

803. Would it not be possible to appoint on the certificates before them?—If they are exactly on the same dead-level I think the appointing body would be at a disadvantage.

804. You suggest that a woman should get the same salary as a man up to an average attendance of 20?—Yes.

805. Would you approve of the same salary being paid to men and women in classes up to 30 in attendance?—I do not know that I should make any rigid demarcation about that.

806. I should like to know if you would suggest that they should get the same salary?—I do not know that I care to contradict my previous evidence.

807. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] At what time do you think a sole teacher should get assistance?—I think the assistance should be at the same average as now. I would not alter that. I would give a partly trained pupil-teacher instead of a mistress.

808. *Mr. Weston.*] A lawyer, after he has passed his examination, obtains his certificate to enable him to practise; a doctor likewise; and the doctor and lawyer take their chance of getting business: do you not think that a teacher, when he passes his examination and is licensed, should take his chance, and therefore render future certificates unnecessary?—No, I do not think the cases are on all-fours.

809. You do not think that a teacher, after being once licensed, could safely rely on his credentials as time went on?—No; I do not see where these credentials are to come from.

810. From Inspectors, teachers, and Boards?—No; I think that if they were crystallized in a higher certificate they would be of more worth to him.

811. Is it not natural with this district, as with North Canterbury, Wellington, and the other districts in the colony, that in the matter of vacancies Boards would rather appoint their own men than go out of the district?—They do so.

812. Why say, then, that the teachers are boycotted?—If they prefer their own to an outsider.

813. "Boycott" suggests that an undue practice is adopted: is the practice that now obtains in the various districts unjust, unfair, and wicked?—I do not know about wicked, but I think it is unfair and unjust.

814. And therefore people should ignore the pupil-teachers they have brought up in their districts and go outside for teachers?—No, it does not follow.

815. Then, why say they are boycotted?—Because in filling up a position of some value and emolument a better teacher from outside, and better certificated, will be set aside for an inferior teacher in the district who had sufficient influence.

816. Have you known cases where a district has gone out of its way to elect inferior teachers when teachers of better qualities from outside could have been obtained?—I could not give you instances, because I have not kept a record; but there are instances.

817. They would be few and far between?—No; as a matter of fact, teachers have practically left off applying for positions outside their own district.

818. Because Boards prefer teachers they have trained themselves to teachers they do not know?—Yes.

819. Is that not natural?—It might be.

820. Then, you are not justified in using that extravagant term "boycotting"?—The term is possibly too strong, but it was not I who used the term. It was put to me, and I merely replied to it. I noticed it at the time, but did not care to object.

821. Do you consider, with pupil-teachers teaching as they do all day, that the children in the schools receive the education they ought to get within those walls?—I do not think pupil-teachers have a great deal to do with the education of children, at any rate, until towards the end of their apprenticeship.

822. But they do work, and I presume what they do is accepted by the teacher?—Yes.

823. I presume it is impossible for a teacher to examine minutely the work a pupil-teacher does?—No; but the work of a pupil-teacher does not require much examination.

824. Do you think it is right that the babies and the First Class should be intrusted to pupil-teachers?—It is not unjust, if the pupil-teacher is nearly at the end of her apprenticeship.

825. Then, anything less than that would be unfair to the children?—Yes.

826. Do you think that justice can be done to pupil-teachers when they are employed all day long in teaching?—I know their life is a very hard one.

827. Is that doing justice to them?—No.

828. If a good class of teachers is to be trained, should not the pupil-teachers have their time divided between teaching and learning?—That is the best system, if it can be done.

829. How could it not be done?—It would want a duplicate set of pupil-teachers.

830. Apart from the question of money, you think it should be done?—Yes.

831. With a colonial scale of salaries, would it not be necessary that the pupil-teacher's time should be divided between teaching and learning?—I do not think that follows, because you have not an ideal system in other parts of the profession.

832. You do not want to work to a good standard?—Yes.

833. If pupil-teachers have not been properly taught, how can they stand side by side with teachers who have been properly taught?—I do not know of any part of the colony that gives them that course of study—half a day's work and half a day's learning.

834. Is it not right and proper that it should be done?—Yes.

835. When there is no training establishment in any district, is it not the more necessary that the pupil-teacher's time should be divided between teaching and learning?—I do not know that it is essential; it is desirable, perhaps, but everything that is desirable is not essential.

836. Will you be good enough to tell me which is the hardest class of school for a teacher to teach?—I do not know. I have not had experience in every class of school.

837. Are you able to say whether a man or woman conducting a standard has an easier task than the man who has all the standards in, say, a school of 40?—I consider the man who has charge of the standard has the heavier work. The man with all the standards may have more worry, but he has not the same physical strain.

838. How many do you think there should be in a class?—60.

839. Which man has the greatest and most irksome duty—the man with 60 in his class, or the sole teacher of a school having all the standards?—The man with a school of 40; but he has not the hardest task. It does not impose the same physical strain as does a large class.

840. If more wearisome, it must be more trying to the constitution and the nervous energy?—I do not know; but teachers who have gone from a large class to a small school do not, as a rule, complain of the extra work.

841. Do you think that scholarships in our primary schools should be increased in number?—Yes; as much as is it possible to afford.

842. Do you think, then, that the children taking the scholarships and entering the secondary schools would be better fitted to become teachers in our primary schools?—Yes.

843. Do you think that pupils from the secondary schools should require technical knowledge in a training-school, or elsewhere?—I should say, first in the primary school, and after that in the training-school.

844. You do not think that would take up too many years of their life?—No; as a matter of fact, the great majority of them follow that course now.

845. You have a young lady by the name of Hannah Percy?—We have her successor.

846. What salary is she getting—£149 10s. 6d.?—Yes.

847. Are there any other licentiates?—No. She was a very old servant of the Board, and very skilful, and the Board never insisted on her going up for a certificate.

848. Then, there is another at Wainui: do you approve of those licentiates being in the service?—That licentiate is a man, and came out from Home. I have no opinion to offer as to the principle.

849. Do you think that the power of appointing, transferring, and dismissing should be left entirely with the Board?—I think appointing should be in the hands of the Board, but not transferring.

850. Then, you think that the Committee should not be considered?—Yes, if they have information which the Board has not; but I would not leave either the appointment or the selection of a teacher in the hands of the Committee.

851. *Mr. Hogben.*] Would your first male assistant be reduced in salary if he received the same as he would under the Otago scale—£240 per annum?—No; practically he would be unchanged.

852. Would your second assistant be reduced if he received £175 per annum?—No; he would get a very substantial rise.

853. If your mistress were to get £155 would she gain?—Yes; she gets £149 now.

854. Do you consider that the proportion of pupil-teachers to adult teachers in Hawke's Bay is rather large?—Yes.

855. In a school of 205 how many adult teachers are there under the Hawke's Bay scale?—Three.

856. That gives an average of 68·3 pupils per adult teacher?—Yes.

857. Under the proposed alternative scale, take a school of 225, how many adult teachers would there be?—Four.

858. That is an average of 56·25?—Yes.

859. Take a school of 425, how many adult teachers are given by the Hawke's Bay scale?—Five.

860. That is an average of 85 pupils per adult teacher?—Yes.

861. In a school of 450 under the proposed scale how many adult teachers are allowed?—Seven.

862. That gives 64 pupils per adult teacher?—Yes.

863. Under the Hawke's Bay scale how many adult teachers are there in a school of 530?—Six.

864. That will give an average of a little over 88 pupils per adult?—Yes.

865. Take a school of 540 under the proposed scale, how many adult teachers will be allowed?—Eight.

866. That would be 67·4 pupils per adult teacher?—Yes.

867. In a school of 775 how many adult teachers are allowed by the Hawke's Bay scale?—Nine.

868. That is an average of 86 per adult teacher?—Yes.

869. Under the proposed scale what would be the allowance of teachers for a school of 760?—Ten.

870. That would be an average of 76 per adult teacher?—Yes.

871. *The Chairman.*] Are you in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.

872. Do you think that if the salaries of the two sexes were made equal women would be likely to be pushed out of the medium-sized schools?—I think so.

873. If the salaries are made grossly unequal there is a danger of the men being pushed out?—Yes; provided you reduce below the level of other markets. It is purely a case of market in both sexes.

874. Are you in a position to say that when good vacancies occur in other districts in New Zealand a large number of applications do not travel from outside?—Applications may travel, but the persons who make them rarely travel. I will put it this way: the number of applications is greatly reduced from what it would be if the vacancies were thrown open to the whole of the colony.

875. If that is an injustice that teachers are suffering from, are you of opinion that appointments should be left to the Boards?—Yes.

876. Do you not think that one result of the colonial scale will be to take away the power of appointments from the Boards and place it in the hands of the department?—It might be like jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire.

877. Might it not make your position worse than it is?—It might.

878. You do not think a teacher should be a Civil servant?—I do not. I am not aspiring to be a Civil servant by any means.

879. But I think you said you were of opinion that the Inspectors should be under the control of the department?—Yes, so long as their special knowledge and skill is at the service of the Board they are with for the time being.

880. What benefit would be derived from that?—You get a change of Inspector, and there is not so much danger of getting into one man's groove.

881. Do you think that a change of Inspectors would be a benefit to this district?—No; I am afraid that other districts would get the benefit.

882. Then, you are asking for a thing that would be to your detriment?—Only for the time being.

883. Would it not be unpleasant for the district?—No, I do not think so. I think the Inspector would be the chief sufferer.

884. Then, you think that a man who comes fresh to the district would be in a better position to judge of the abilities of the teachers, and improve the method of conducting their schools, than a man stationed in the district for a number of years?—He would be entirely free from prejudice, and be able to judge a school without judging the teacher altogether. Of course, he would not have the same power of comparison as the man who had examined the school year by year.

J. C. Westall, Member of the Hawke's Bay Education Board, examined.

Mr. Westall: I am a member of the Hawke's Bay Education Board, and was formerly a teacher under the Board. With your permission I should like to make a few remarks on the status of the Board here. I should like to say that, as far as I am aware, the teachers and the members of the Board have been, and still are, and I hope in increasing ratio will be, a happy family. I think I am warranted in saying that I have personal grounds for stating that the Teachers' Institute are on good terms with the Board, and they recognise our desire to do our duty to the teachers; and we recognise the teachers' desire to do their duty to the Board. I think it has been understood hitherto that the scale of the Board has been a fair scale of payment. When I was a teacher under the Board I found out that the salary of the middle-sized schools was small, but I think you will find that the payments of the Board on our basis are very fair and very equitable—in fact, the salaries in some respects are high. But what I wanted to point out is this: If you tot up the cost of education per head of two or three schools in different districts, and make that a basis of comparative payment, you will land yourselves in a hole, because it entirely depends on the staffing of the school. The staffing being different, the cost of education cannot be estimated in that way. The question of town and country schools is a very vexed question indeed, and it is the opinion of the Board that our people below £175 were not getting a large enough salary; and when the proposed addition was granted by the Government recently, we decided that the entire amount of the increased capitation was to go to help those teachers whose salaries were below £175, and we acted on that principle and allotted the payments on that scale, and made a recommendation to the Government—a recommendation which has not been complied with, because the department had its own method of allotting it. With regard to transferring from the general fund to the building fund, I thought before I came on to the Board that something was wrong in the process; but after looking at the Education Act, and finding out how the Board's funds were allowed to be diverted, I was perfectly convinced that our position was thoroughly sound in that matter. It is our duty to find money for the school-buildings, and to keep these buildings in repair; and it is just as much our duty to do that as to pay the teachers. The only question that arises is one of adjustment. If you will look at our balance-sheet you will find that our entire capitation grant and the balance is required every year to keep things going; and if we had not had a balance from the previous year, which had been acquired in more fortunate times, we should have been bankrupt long ago. I do not agree with Dr. Sidey that it would have been necessary to reduce salaries, but I do say that our balance is a diminishing quantity; and since I came on the Board I have been impressed with the cost of running the schools in the district and keeping them in repair. Under our regulations small schools under 80 are supposed to be taken by a female, but the evidence given before would lead one to suppose that that is now a dead-letter, and that we are putting men into those schools, to the disadvantage of the ladies. As a matter of fact, the thing is the other way. Masters have put themselves into this position because they are glad to go in and take this class of school, even though they have to pay a sewing-mistress to teach the sewing. I should like to say, with regard to scholarship results, that I look on the ordinary scholarship examination as a very desirable thing, but not essential to a child's education; and I cannot even agree that, although a teacher might have a

good scholarship result one year, he must necessarily have a school in a very efficient state, or have a first-class school. The gaining of scholarships is the result of individual painstaking on the part of the pupil, and self-devotion on the part of the teacher, but is not a test of school efficiency. If you look at the number of children over the whole district who do get scholarships it is, of course, infinitesimal.

885. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you in favour of a colonial scale of salaries and staffing?—I do not think I am qualified to give an opinion on the question of staffing; but, with regard to the scale of salaries, I should be more in favour of seeing a minimum or compulsory wage laid down, and the Boards to be allowed to increase the payments on that minimum as they thought fit.

886. Are you aware that great dissatisfaction exists in different parts of the colony amongst teachers?—I have reason to suppose that such is the case, but we do not hear anything of it in our Board.

887. As a former teacher, you are aware that very great inequalities exist in the rates of salaries in the various districts?—That is so.

888. Do you not think that the existence of these inequalities would be likely to cause dissatisfaction?—Of course, it appears to me that if a teacher was dissatisfied with the payment of his own particular district he would endeavour to get out of that district into another.

889. You know, I suppose, that it is very difficult for a teacher in one district to get into another district under present conditions?—I have every reason to suppose that that is so.

890. If the salaries in a particular district are higher than those paid to similar positions in other districts, do you not think it is natural for the best teachers to gravitate to the districts where the highest rates of salary are paid?—Yes; but, owing to the difficulty there is in getting into that district, the higher salaries simply operate for the teachers in that district.

891. Do you not think it is fair that in a national system of education equal rates of salary throughout the colony should obtain?—I am bound to agree with you.

892. Having a uniform system of classification of teachers and a uniform syllabus, do you not think it would be in the interests of education that we should have a uniform rate of pay?—I do not see why you should not make up the funds of the Boards to enable them to pay a minimum living-wage, and make up the rest out of capitation.

893. The main object of a uniform salary is to abolish the inequalities that at present exist?—I suppose that is so.

894. Could you explain any system other than a uniform scale of salary that would have that effect?—It seems to me that the great idea is to avoid interfering as much as possible with the functions of the Board. Let the Board still be responsible to the department for the management of the capitation grant, but fix a minimum wage at such intervals as you decide on, and let the Boards do the best they can as far as funds afford.

895. Do you think, if Boards were paid on a scale drawn up by this Commission, and that they received the money from the department and paid it to their teachers, that would in any way weaken the authority of the Board over its teachers?—If you put it that the Boards were to be instructed that they were to pay certain salaries for certain positions, and they were to pay out the money forwarded from the department, you would put the Boards in the position of a bank who simply had to pay out cheques. You might as well pay them cheques direct from the department. You would get uniformity in that way.

896. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider it would be preferable to give the extra capitation to the Boards, and allow them to draw up their own scale of staffs and salaries?—I am not quite sure that it would. I think you have got the chance now of fixing a minimum wage, and it would be a good thing to fix it once and for all.

897. Were you a member of the Institute when a teacher?—Yes.

898. Did these matters come before the Institute, and were they discussed at that time?—I really do not remember. The meetings were held at intervals, and the attendance was very small. I did not take any great interest in it.

899. Anyhow, you feel inclined to take the side of the Education Boards?—No; I would stick out for the right.

900. You think the Education Boards are generally right?—I think it is better to have some organization than none at all. I cannot see what is to supplant the Boards.

901. Have we any guarantee that the other twelve Boards would do the same as your Board would do in the matter of increasing the lower salaries?—I cannot say.

902. Then, there is no chance of uniformity?—It does not look like it.

903. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you think it would be possible for the Hawke's Bay Education Board to give the salaries that are proposed in the scale on a capitation basis of £4?—I cannot say; I have not gone into it.

904. You obtained your certificate in this district?—Yes.

905. Did you find any difficulty in obtaining a situation in this district?—I was first appointed as *locum tenens* at a school. After I left I got a license to teach, and then passed the matriculation examination; that gave me D, and I was appointed to a school again. I remained there for eleven years, during which time I raised myself to B1. I repeatedly tried to get into other districts, but could not; and when I left, my salary was less than when I went there.

906. The Board did not put any restriction on you getting another school?—No; but I could not get it.

907. Do you agree that the only direction in which a colonial scale should go should be the fixing of a minimum wage?—Yes; only you are going to have a system of classification right through.

908. Would you have grading?—Yes.

909. According to what?—According to time of service, and Inspector's reports or marks.

910. Do you agree with the present method of issuing certificates?—No; it is absurd. The certificates are useless for showing anything more than university status.

911. Do you think a different plan should be adopted in the method of classifying teachers?—Unquestionably.

912. *Mr. Weston.*] I understand you would leave the assessing and allocation of salaries in the hands of the Board, but that there should be some statutory enactment, or some Government regulation made, whereby the minimum salary should, under any circumstances, be fixed?—Yes; in conjunction with the department being compelled to pay to the Boards sufficient to pay this minimum salary.

913. *The Chairman.*] In your opinion, are the teachers of this district fairly well paid?—Fairly well paid in the larger schools; but in some of the smaller schools they are not fairly paid.

914. If the salaries are inadequate for certain schools, with whom does the fault lie?—I think it lies outside the classification. It lies in one way with the people content to take the lower salary; and in another way with the Government, who will not give a higher salary.

915. The fault is not in the distribution by the Board?—I think there is fault there; it might be better distributed.

916. When vacancies occur in your district have you much difficulty in obtaining teachers?—No. We have no difficulty whatever in obtaining teachers for the better class of schools, but we have for the back-block schools up-country.

917. Where the salaries are good there is plenty of competition?—Yes. It is entirely a question of salary.

JAMES HISLOP, Assistant Master of the Napier Boys' School, examined.

Mr. Hislop: I am here to represent the male assistants in this district. I may state at the beginning that any calcuations I have made are based on the report for 1899, and also upon the first scheme submitted by the Inspector-General. I am informed that under the alternative scheme the assistant teachers have been provided for, and will not suffer the reduction that was first proposed, so that certain remarks I make will perhaps, in that respect, require qualification, for when our statement was prepared we had no idea of any alternate scheme. According to the 1899 report and basing our calculations upon it, we find that in Hawke's Bay twelve male assistants would stand to lose £391 2s., or on the average £32 11s. 10d., the losses varying from £19 8s. to £61 5s. In the Napier school alone, two assistants, including a female teacher, would gain £34 5s., but the remaining six assistants would lose £170 in the aggregate, and there would be a total loss in the salary in the school of £288, including the salary of the headmaster. Throughout the district six male assistants would gain a total of £79 15s.—or rather male and female assistants—and forty-one would lose a total of £737—that is to say, out of a total of forty-seven assistants only six will be benefited, while forty-one will suffer reduction. As I pointed out, twelve male assistants lose a total of £391 2s., but why should these assistants have to suffer reduction? In the past many Education Boards, evidently recognising the importance of the assistants' positions have offered very fair salaries to their assistants, and good men and women have been attracted to these positions. Now, however, they are told that the Boards have been mistaken, and that the positions they occupy and the work they do are not worth the salaries paid. This will come as a very great hardship to the assistants, the male assistants particularly, for, as I said, I speak on their behalf. They are brought face to face with retrenchment, the retrenchment being in some cases very great, the greatest amount being £61 5s., and that through no fault of their own; whereas had they not been attracted to these positions, they would probably now be holding headmasterships of fair-sized schools with the prospect of an increase in salary; and, as compared with what they will now receive as assistants, a very considerable increase. Let us take, for the sake of comparison, the position of an assistant master in a school with an attendance of 750 to 780, and that of the headmaster of a country school of, say, 150 of an average attendance—take the Havelock School, which I believe last quarter had an attendance of 147. The assistant master in the large school would receive £230 per annum, fixed. From this he would have to deduct £50 for house rent, leaving a net balance of £180. I make the deduction for rent in order to get a proper comparison, as most country schools have a teacher's residence attached. £180 is certainly not a very munificent sum for a teacher who would occupy such an important position as that of first assistant in one of the largest schools in the colony. There are five having more than 750 in attendance, according to the 1899 report. On the other hand, the headmaster of the country school would receive £219 or £237, according to the alternative scale, with a rise of 6s. or 8s. per head, and, as well, he would have a house, rent-free, receiving thus £29 or £57 more than the asssistant, although he does not occupy such an important relative position. Added to this is the fact that living is cheaper in the country than in the town. I have in my mind also the case of a school of an attendance of 91, where the headmaster, according to the alternative scheme, would receive £210 and his house, and would be placed on a better footing than the assistant master of a large school. Instances have occurred in our own district where both male and female teachers have found the work in towns very heavy; they state there is no comparison between the work in the country and the work in the towns, and they were not willing to go back to the towns. I would like to compare the work in the schools I instanced: In the small school the headmaster would have two assistants and a pupil-teacher to help him; probably a little energy would raise his average to 151, and he would get another pupil-teacher, while in large schools assistants usually have from 70 to 120 pupils in the upper standards, and surely this work is heavier than that of the work of the headmaster of a small school, who probably has charge of Standards IV., V., and VI., numbering between 30 and 40 pupils. Even under present conditions many masters of country schools seem quite satisfied to remain where they are, even when a chance of increased

salary in a position in town is offered. They are convinced, I suppose, that, if they did get higher salaries, they would have to work harder, and so they preferred to remain where they were. If there is any reduction in assistants' salaries it will have the tendency to make the assistants leave the town schools for the headmasterships of country schools. The positions of assistants in large schools will thus become, in a sense, filled only temporarily. Assistants in the large schools will be juniors—men of lower grade certificates, and men of least experience—or probably men who will not be accepted for other positions. As soon as these juniors have had a little experience they will aspire to easier work and a higher salary, and so the changes will go on. In the past these positions have been filled by men of high and varied qualifications and long experience, presumably on account of the importance of the work. Men of experience are required, again, because children in towns require more managing than country children. The constant changes I have referred to, thus caused, and the less experience in the teachers in large schools cannot fail to be most prejudicial to good work. Account must be taken of the fact that the assistants have to pass through their hands a very large number of children—that is, they have practically the shaping of their future lives, the training of our future citizens, our future law-makers. In Hawke's Bay twelve male assistants have to assist in moulding the minds of 3,097 pupils out of 6,329, or, excluding the training-school, which is on a somewhat different footing, 6,113. According to the proposed scale No. 1 there has to be a very considerable increase in the attendance before there is any increase in salary. First assistant, 570 to 660, 660 to 750, 750 to 840; second assistant, 600 to 690, 690 to 780, 780 to 930. Now, I think, in all large schools the work of the assistants certainly does increase as the average attendance increases, and therefore there should be a sliding scale on a different basis. There is another point that has attracted considerable attention for some years—namely, the difficulty of getting boys to enter the profession. I, myself, know of a fair number of youths who have entered the profession, but soon found that a teacher's life was not such an easy one as they imagined, and that they were not likely to make their fortunes if they remained teachers. They are now in good positions in commercial life, earning better salaries than they were likely to have obtained as teachers; and I am sure have not the worries they would have had, if they had continued in our profession. In conclusion, I should like to state the staffing—or I should rather say the average number of pupils per teacher in the Napier school as giving an idea of the amount of work that the assistants in large schools have to perform. Our present staff is a headmaster, nine assistants—counting two juniors who fill one position—and nine pupil-teachers, making a total of nineteen. The average attendance is 778, and, according to what I have seen of the second scale, there will be a total of eighteen teachers, with an average of 41·6 pupils per teacher; if the pupil-teachers are left out of consideration, according to the second scale, there will be ten adult teachers, with an average for each teacher of 77·8 pupils.

918. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You say that your experience is that teachers, after going to country schools from town schools, do not care to return and take up positions in the town schools?—That is so.

919. Suppose a vacancy is advertised in a town school at a salary of £80 a year, how many applications will you get for that position?—I am not in a position to judge—the applications go to the Board.

920. Suppose a vacancy in a country school at the same salary—£80 a year—was advertised, do you think there would be as many applications for that position as for the town position?—I cannot say; I am not in a position to judge.

921. Do you mean to tell me that a teacher occupying the position you do, and after the statement you made in regard to the relative positions, that you cannot say whether the number of applications would be greater in one case than another?—As far as I know, the applications are on an equality.

922. Do you not think that country teachers are very anxious to get into the towns in order to improve themselves in their studies, and, if they are married, in order to give their children better prospects of advancement?—Some of them, no doubt, may be.

923. Do you approve of the contemplated scale of salaries?—If the alternative scale treats the assistant teachers as I have been informed it proposes to do, then I approve of it.

924. According to the report here, you receive a salary of £291?—Yes; but not now.

925. Do you wish to see the salaries of assistants built up to the level—all over the colony—of the salaries paid in your school?—Yes, I should be quite satisfied to see that.

926. If the £4 capitation grant is not sufficient to build up the salaries to that level, would you be content to strike a general average to improve salaries all round?—Looking at it personally I would not be satisfied, but from a general principle I would be satisfied.

927. Do you prepare your boys for the Civil Service Examination?—No.

928. Have you thought out at what point country-school teachers should receive the same salary as what you receive?—I should say, in schools with an attendance from 250 to 300.

929. Do you consider that women should be intrusted with Standards IV., V., and VI.?—No.

930. Would you be willing that the headmaster should have the power to give women teachers Standards IV., V., and VI. if he thought she showed exceptional ability in managing these standards?—I know that our headmaster has strong views on that point, and I know he would not do so. I do not think lady teachers are physically fit to take the upper standards.

931. You are aware some are?—I think, very few.

932. Would you bar a woman teacher if she proved capable?—A headmaster has power to arrange his staff as he likes.

933. Should the scheme be sufficiently elastic to enable a woman, if she is qualified, to perform that work?—I think male teachers should do the higher work and take charge of the upper standards.

934. Would you not let the head-teacher have the right to say whether a woman is qualified for the work?—It should be left in the hands of the head-teacher.

935. Suppose you were head-teacher, would you like to have the discretionary power?—Yes, I should.

936. In schools of 45 in attendance would you pay male and female teachers equal salaries?—Yes.

937. If women are in charge of schools just now of 60 pupils, and doing the work well, would you disturb existing affairs?—No.

938. *Mr. Davidson.*] If the statement made in connection with the alternative scale—No. 2—is correct, you are satisfied with the scale?—Yes, from the statement made to me.

939. If the statement made that the salaries of assistants will be brought up to the existing level, to the scale paid in either Otago or North Canterbury, and that those few assistants receiving a higher rate of pay will not have their salaries reduced, you will be satisfied?—Yes.

940. You are in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—As a general principle, yes.

941. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you know any other part of the colony in which a first assistant will get the salary you are receiving?—No.

942. Do you consider you are receiving too high a salary?—No.

943. You consider the other assistants are receiving insufficient salaries?—Yes.

944. What standard have you charge of?—Standard VI.

945. How many pupils are there in the standard?—82.

946. Who has charge of Standard V.?—The third assistant master.

947. How many pupils are there in his standard?—90.

948. What is the difference between the salary he receives and the salary you receive?—£140.

949. Do you not consider that is too great a difference when he is doing practically the same work?—I do not know that he is doing the same work; if you go into details, into the interior working, you would find that I, as first assistant, have many duties to perform over and above his duties.

950. You recognise that, in order to bring the salaries of first assistants throughout the colony up to the salary you are receiving, it will entail a considerable increase of expenditure?—Yes.

951. *The Chairman.*] The other assistant master you spoke of has charge of Standard V.?—Yes, with the assistance of a pupil-teacher.

952. What is the salary paid to the pupil-teacher?—I think, £46.

953. What is the salary of the assistant master in charge of Standard V.?—£150.

Miss Burden, Head-teacher, Kumeroa School, examined.

954. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you in favour of the pay to men and women being equalised, or the disparity at present existing being very much decreased?—Most certainly. It is impossible to ask for equal pay, but there is far too much difference according to the proposed scale.

955. What class of schools do you think should be thrown open at equal salary to either sex?—Speaking from experience, I think that a woman is quite capable of taking charge of a school up to 100. I think the average woman is quite capable of managing such a school.

956. Which do you think a woman would the sooner break down under—the strain of teaching and managing a class in a city school of, say, 60 or 70 pupils, or doing the work with the assistance you now have?—I am rather inclined to think she would break down sooner in the large city school; it is easier to maintain discipline in a country school than in an upper standard of a city school.

957. Suppose the schools in the colony up to 100 were thrown open to either sex, do you think that women would be preferred rather than men?—I think they would be in a great many cases. In the school I at present occupy they had a male teacher up till the time I took charge eight years ago.

958. What classes do you yourself teach?—I have 45 scholars in five classes—Standards III., IV., V., VI., and VII.

959. Who takes the primary class and Standards I. and II.?—My assistant.

960. Is the salary under the Hawke's Bay Board for that class of school the same for either sex?—Yes.

961. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the suggested scale No. 2 with the salaries that obtain in your school just now?—Yes.

962. Do they compare favourably or otherwise?—At present the school costs the country £216. Under the alternative scale, with a male head-teacher and assistant, the cost would be £295; with a female head-teacher and assistant, under the alternative scale, the cost would be £261. I may explain that the average of my school, although I have taken it at 80, is not actually 80—it is 79. When it reaches 80 I will be entitled to a pupil-teacher.

963. The pupil-teacher does not come till you reach 91?—I meant under the Hawke's Bay scale.

964. Do you favour the suggested scheme of alternating male and female teachers in the larger schools?—Not at all. In my own case it would be rather ludicrous. I would have appointed into my school a male teacher; I would not feel inclined to give up my upper standards to an assistant, and he would have to take to teaching the babies.

965. Do you find that preference is given to female teachers in the Hawke's Bay District?—I am afraid I cannot answer that; I know very little of the applications and appointments. I have not applied for a position since I was appointed to my present school.

966. Do you think there would be any difficulty in the matter of sewing instruction in the case of male teachers being appointed to country schools?—I think they could always obtain a sewing-mistress. Certainly the instruction would not be as efficient as that given by the school-mistress.

967. *Mr. Hill.*] Would the adoption of this proposed scale benefit you very much?—No. My present salary is £156; if were a man I would get £177 under the proposed scale, but being a woman I would get £147.

968. Have you any objection to the proposed colonial scale on account of that?—If a woman is capable of taking charge of a school I do not see why, because she happens to be a woman, she should be more poorly paid than a man.

969. If a colonial scale is adopted, do you think it would affect your position: would the Committee approve your continuance in charge?—I do not think it would affect me. If the Committee had been anxious to have a man they could have had one. The appointment of a male or a female teacher is optional in schools up to 80.

970. You are aware that for your position the proposed scale would require a teacher with a D1 certificate?—Yes.

971. You know you would have to pay a certain kind of fine because you only have an E1 certificate?—Yes.

972. Do you think that ought to be?—No.

973. You think you can do your work in the school as well as a D1 could?—Yes.

974. What do you think about the proposal regarding fifth-year pupil-teachers?—It does not seem altogether just.

975. *Mr. Smith.*] A great deal has been said about the physical ability of ladies in charge of schools: may I ask how many years you have been teaching your present school?—Eight years.

976. How many months, weeks, days, or hours have you had to be away on sick-leave?—Owing to a buggy accident I was absent three weeks, and that was my first and last absence through illness in a teaching career of eighteen years.

977. How many bad reports have you had during the past eight years?—I do not remember having had one.

978. Do you consider yourself something more than a woman of average strength?—I am by no means exceptional.

979. Do you think your health is likely to suffer in the future from overstrain?—No.

980. *The Chairman.*] Are you a member of the Teachers' Institute?—Not since I went to the country.

981. Do you think that a woman should be disqualified from taking schools with over 40 of average attendance?—I see no reason why we should be disqualified.

982. Do you think they should be disqualified by the Teachers' Institute of New Zealand?—I do not think they should be disqualified if capable.

983. If capable to take charge of schools over 400?—When they have proved themselves incapable I think it is time to disqualify them.

ROBERT BOYD HOLMES, Head-teacher, Havelock, examined.

Mr. Holmes: I did intend to refer to some matters at length, but really, after the exhaustive statements made by the president of the local branch of the Institute, it is unnecessary for me to go much further than simply to say that in the main I corroborate Mr. Watson's evidence. I may say that I am secretary for the branch, and in that capacity I come into contact with teachers throughout the district from the East Cape right down to Woodville, and I have communication with them day after day; and since this colonial scale has been before the public they have thought that I should be able to give explanation in every shape and form. As far as I myself am concerned, I support the colonial scale very strongly. There are some things in it that I would like to see altered. I take first the matter of staffing. I think the staffing is largely in favour of the larger schools, though I am glad to acknowledge that it benefits, so far as this district is concerned, the class of schools to which mine belongs. For instance, I get an extra assistant, and by having an increase of 5 pupils I can retain my present number of pupil-teachers, so that I confess the staffing is a great improvement on the present Hawke's Bay scale. I take some exceptions to the scale itself. In the first place, I believe that with the £4 grant it is too liberal to give an assistant at 40 as is proposed. My idea, after twenty-seven years of experience, is that I would grant a pupil-teacher at 35, and up to 55; then when the average is 55 an assistant up to, we will say, 85; and then a pupil-teacher in addition to the assistant after that. I would also appoint a second pupil-teacher at 105, and then an assistant at 140; so that I would make use of pupil-teachers in the smaller class of schools more than in the larger, because you can understand that in a school up to medium size it is not the number of children, but the number of classes that you have to attend to, that causes the worry and it is to get over this difficulty that I would follow this course. I have drawn up a scale of staffing, and will submit it to the Commission. In calculating the average attendance I think some allowance should be made to country school. I think you will get a much higher average of children to attend in town than in the country. The dairying industry, potato-planting, and many other things take away the children a great deal more than is the case in the town. I say country children are kept at home—some justly and others unjustly—more than in the town, and a great many of them are outside the radius of the Truant Officer. It is not unusual for children to go three, four, and five miles to school. I think, therefore, in fixing the staff for country schools some consideration should be given to that question. I would also point out that in trying to make a scale I have gone on the assumption that an adult teacher is equal to two pupil-teachers. In connection with the pupil-teachers I would also suggest that they should be under the absolute control of the Board, and that the Board should have the power of removing them from school to school; and, further, that no pupil-teacher should be allowed to go through the apprenticeship without having been employed in at least two schools—a big school and a small school. I consider that the pay given to pupil-

teachers is out of all proportion to what it is proposed to give them when they become junior assistants. It is not the amount of money that any one gets to start with that really induces him to join a particular profession. It is the amount he is likely to receive in the ordinary course of events. In this district we have been in the habit of receiving money for the tuition of pupil-teachers, and our regulations say that every assistant in the school is to assist in training the pupil-teachers, but the headmaster gets all the bonus. I consider that the salaries under the colonial scale should be of such a nature as to include the training of the pupil-teachers. I do not think that any bonus should be given for training pupil-teachers, but I think that all the teachers in the school should have to assist in the instruction. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything on the question of salaries, as the matter has been very fully dealt with. I only know that the salaries of the great bulk of the school-teachers not only in Hawke's Bay, but in New Zealand, have been anything but satisfactory or adequate. I will just give you a sample of jottings from letters sent in to me a few days ago. A teacher says, "A man who has to choose between spending money on a necessary pair of boots and a necessary expenditure for his school is in a position which bodes no good to the education of the colony. A policy of more oats will give more power. A country teacher is a power for greater good than an assistant in town. The latter is dwarfed. His influence, unless a teacher of Standards V. and VI., will be very small on the children, and he is known only to his set in the town. A country teacher has to be a leader in the place. He is looked to and known intimately by all, and as such should be a man of greater ability and character than the assistant, as his position is much more important. The calls on the country teacher are much heavier than those on the town teacher. He has to subscribe to every church, and be the promoter of every movement in the place. His time is much more fully occupied than that of the assistant. When school is over he has to turn to and cut the wood or do the garden-work. He has to keep a horse and trap, all of which mean time and expense. The assistant is usually a boarder, and he has nothing to do but his own sweet will after school-hours." That gentleman has occupied a position in and about the neighbourhood of Christchurch, and has also occupied positions in the country schools of Canterbury. I am very glad that the assistants are receiving consideration, particularly infant mistresses. I consider that of all the teachers employed as assistants, after the first assistant master, the infant mistress is the greatest power for good, and does the most effective work; and therefore I think that the infant mistress should receive every consideration under a colonial scale. There is another point I wish to bring before the notice of the Commission, and that is the allowance to School Committees. For the ten years ending the 31st March, 1901, the Committee of my school received from the Board £404 4s. Cleaning and so forth cost £175 13s.; fuel and stationery cost £70 16s. 9d.; and grants were made to the Board, or work was done that was the duty of the Board to perform, to the extent of £166 2s. 6d. If one School Committee can do that, why should not all School Committees try and do so? I place before the Commission a detailed statement.

984. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] It has been stated that teachers prefer living in the country to living in the towns: is that so?—I never heard of it until to-day.

985. Is the number of applications for positions in the country as numerous as for positions in the town?—I think there would be no comparison.

986. Do you not think that in any scale of salaries the country teachers ought to have the preference in the town appointments?—I would not go so far as that, but I should say that the applicants for every appointment should be carefully studied, and if you can get a country teacher into the town it would be well to encourage him.

987. Is it not a fact that when a man gets into a country district——?—When a man gets into the country he is done.

988. Do you not think, then, that when a man has been in the country, and when a vacancy occurs in the town, that, all things being equal, the man in the country should get the preference?—Certainly I do.

989. Do you believe in payment on the average or on the roll?—That is a point in which I differ from a good many of my brother teachers. I think, so long as the grant is so-much per head, you cannot get away from it. I think, of course, that the total number of children *bonâ fide* belonging to a school should have a great deal to do with the staffing and salary.

990. Whatever they work on, some consideration should be given for the attendance at country schools?—Yes.

991. Do you consider that the work of the first assistant in the Napier School is very much heavier than the work that you do?—I cannot see how it can be.

992. You would say that a man with a school of 140 should get as good a salary as the first assistant in a large school?—I should think so.

993. You do not think that a man should wait till he is headmaster of a school of 300 before he gets the same salary as a first assistant?—He would have to wait all his life for it then.

994. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is your opinion as to the first assistance a head-teacher should receive, what form of assistance, and when should it be granted?—I have submitted a scheme that I think would suit me.

995. You notice that in a school when the average attendance reaches 41 the first assistance takes the form of an assistant mistress?—Yes.

996. Do you approve of that?—I do not think it would be an economy of the grant of £4 to allow a mistress. I think a pupil-teacher who has served one or two years in a large school should be sent to take such a position.

997. Apart from the question of money, do you think, from an educational point of view, it would be wise to put an assistant mistress in a school with an attendance of 40 pupils?—No; I think it would be a waste of energy.

998. Suppose you introduced a partly trained pupil-teacher in schools between 36 and 50 in average attendance, would that meet with your approval?—Yes. My idea is to appoint an assistant in a school with an average attendance of 55 to 85, and then appoint a pupil-teacher.

999. Do you think a headmaster, an assistant mistress, and a pupil-teacher is not a sufficiently liberal staff in a school of 90, as in the suggested scale?—Yes, I would not object to that. At the same time I have to express to the Commission the view that the number of children required to secure a particular average attendance in country schools is out of proportion to the number of children in the town schools; as a rule, you do not get nearly such a high percentage in attendance, and therefore I think the number should be made as low as possible.

1000. Do you know that the required average before such a staff was allowed in Otago, until quite recently, was 110?—Yes; I know up to within recent years it was so.

1001. Recently that required attendance has been reduced to 100 in Otago, and this suggested scale lowers it still further to 90: do you not think that is fairly liberal?—Yes.

1002. What is the average attendance at your school at the present time?—About 145.

1003. And the staff?—Up to lately, a master, an infant mistress, and two pupil-teachers.

1004. You noticed in the suggested scale that at 150 in attendance the staff proposed is a headmaster, an infant mistress, an assistant master, and two pupil-teachers: would that, in your opinion, be a more efficient staff?—Yes, certainly, because an increase of 5 pupils would give me another assistant.

1005. It would be a more ideal staff than what you have at the present time?—Yes.

1006. Have you compared the suggested salary in the alternative scale with the salary you are receiving at the present time?—Yes; it was the first thing I did compare.

1007. You find it more liberal than what is paid in Hawke's Bay at the present time?—Yes; it is an increase of 25 per cent. in some cases.

1008. Are you in favour of penalising teachers who do not hold the certificates required for the various positions in the first suggested scheme?—From the point of sympathy I must say it would be very unjust.

1009. *Mr. Stewart.*] You are in favour of a colonial scale?—Well, I should think so.

1010. Do you think there should be a differentiation in the capitation grant: would it affect the question?—I think the differentiation of capitation would only accentuate the evil that has been going on.

1011. Then, I understand that the Committee allowances must have been ample?—I am not making any comment; I have only given a statement for ten years.

1012. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] What is your opinion?—I am of the opinion that two-thirds of the money would do if properly managed. There is no continuity in the work of Committees.

1013. *Mr. Stewart.*] What do you consider should be the minimum salary?—I have not considered the question of salaries very much—mostly the matter of staffing.

1014. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you carefully looked through the suggested scale?—Yes; through both.

1015. Do you think it equitable that a teacher in a small country school should suffer a reduction of £10 by the introduction of a sewing-mistress into the school?—I do not.

1016. Do you think the appointment of a first-year pupil-teacher is of much assistance to a head-teacher?—Well, you have to make the best of the pupil-teacher—you must appoint one some time. In our district we employ trainees not recognised by the Board; in some cases they have possibly had one or two years' work; then when they are appointed pupil-teachers they are not raw material altogether.

1017. Does the system of appointing trainees work well here?—Yes.

1018. I suppose they can pass their pupil-teacher examinations?—They are not recognised by the Board.

1019. Suppose they pass their pupil-teacher examinations while they are trainees?—They are not permitted to do so.

1020. You advocate that pupil-teachers should be solely under the Board: are they not so now?—No; Committees can object to them leaving; there is no such thing as moving them upon the advice of the Inspector. When pupil-teachers have been one or two years in the service I should like Inspectors to have the power to recommend that they should be transferred to other schools of other grades if it is found desirable.

1021. You think that the salaries paid to teachers should be based on average attendance: would you say the average for one quarter or the average for the whole year?—I think the best way would be to take the average for the year; there are epidemics and other things that would completely upset one's calculations if a quarterly average was taken.

1022. Would you support a proposal that has been submitted in other districts—that is, that salaries should be based on the attendance on examination-day—the number present on the day of the annual examination?—I think that might lead to bad habits.

1023. With regard to the percentage of the working-average, do you consider 50 per cent. high enough?—Yes, I think so. The teachers cannot expect to have everything their own way, and I think 50 per cent. is fair.

1024. Does the working-average very often come into operation in such a school as yours?—Yes, very frequently.

1025. Do you not find that the attendance present one half-day is slightly over 50 per cent.?—Yes, but we have to put up with it.

1026. Do you favour a system of paying bonuses?—I do not.

1027. Not to schools, or teachers on the certificates they hold?—No, I do not.

1028. Did the teachers suffer considerably when the bonuses were withdrawn: did they come to look on the bonuses as part and parcel of their salaries?—Decidedly.

1029. What was the amount of the highest bonus that was paid?—When I came here I got £20.

1030. Was that the highest bonus paid?—No; some of the highest-paid teachers got £30; then it went gradually down to £15, £12, £10, £9, and £6, and finally disappeared altogether.

1031. Seeing that it was a gratuity, then the teachers had no reason to complain when it was withdrawn, had they?—Well, it worked very well, and we were sorry to lose it, because we got no increase to our salaries.

1032. Would you support the substitution of an assistant teacher for two pupil-teachers in a large school?—Yes.

1033. Do the teachers in this district think the adoption of a colonial scale would minimise the powers of the Education Board?—Speaking for myself, I do not see that it can lessen the Board's powers in the least.

1034. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you think the money payable to School Committees' funds is too much?—I simply put figures before the Commission for a period of ten years, and I leave it to the Commission when the matter is under consideration to say whether the money could have been better expended in that particular district which supplied the figures. I was in conversation with a teacher the other day, who told me his late Chairman, on examining the balance-sheet, said to him: "At the end of the year what have we to show? Absolutely nothing. Most of the money is expended in undoing what our predecessors did. If a School Committee has £30 to spend it generally manages to spend £29 19s. 11½d."

1035. In regard to the cleaning and maintenance of schools: in the bush districts the cost of cleaning and looking after the schools would be much heavier, and it would be difficult to get people to do it—the circumstances would be very different to a district like your own, would they not?—I think I would get over the difficulty by getting two or three of the senior pupils to do the cleaning—I would have the school cleaned.

1036. Supposing the pupils would not do the work?—I think they would be only too happy to do it.

1037. Might not the parents object?—Well, rather than be in difficulties I would do it myself for nothing. My Committee during ten years could have managed with two-thirds of the money.

1038. Do you think the teachers of Hawke's Bay would prefer to estimate their salaries, instead of on the average attendance, on the basis of the number present during any week or month?—I have said that while grants are made on average attendance I do not see how you can very well get out of sticking to the average-attendance payment; in country schools, at any rate, a consideration should be given, owing to the smaller proportion of the roll-number in average attendance compared to schools in towns.

1039. I would like to know the opinion of the teachers in Hawke's Bay on the matter?—To be candid with you, it is a question which has never come up for consideration.

1040. What is your opinion?—As a teacher, I cannot see that you could pay on anything else than the working-average.

1041. What is your opinion as to the teacher who should be placed in charge of a school with an average attendance below 30?—I think that the Board and the School Committee should determine that question; it also depends on the salary you are going to give to that class of school. There might be certain obstreperous pupils in the school who would require the control of a male teacher. I think, all round, in schools up to 25 in attendance females would do, and after that males.

1042. Supposing a woman is placed in charge of a school, do you think she should be entitled to the same salary if she was doing the same work and in the same manner as if a male teacher was in charge of a similar school?—I think that the salaries should be differentiated after a living-wage is reached. I think the work is not the same after all.

1043. If you get work done by a female typist do you expect her to charge you at less than the folio rate?—A woman's labour is generally cheaper.

1044. You have not answered the question?—I would not expect her to; as a rule, women have monopolized those positions.

1045. Supposing a position is open—assume you want 50 children taught, and two males apply for the position and ask a salary of £150 a year, while a third applicant, a female, with the same qualification, is willing to take the position at a salary of £100: what do you think will be the result?—I think that the woman would be employed.

1046. Then, would they not lower salaries by entering into competition with males?—No, I think not; in the eternal fitness of things I think men and women fall into their respective positions.

1047. You agree with a colonial scale?—Yes.

1048. You recognise that even the suggested scale proposed by the Inspector-General is more generous than your own scale—the scale in this district?—Certainly.

1049. You think a colonial scale would be beneficial for the colony as a whole?—Yes.

1050. *Mr. Weston.*] You advocate that pupil-teachers should be transferred from one school to another: at whose expense should that be done?—It would be part of the expense of the system.

1051. A number of the pupil-teachers are the children of poorer parents: who would pay for their wants?—I think the State would pay for that.

1052. What did you mean by saying that your school was the worst paid in the colony?—I mean that the salary paid to me under the Hawke's Bay scale is about the smallest in any district in New Zealand. If my school were in Canterbury, instead of getting £190 I would get £215, and in Wellington I would get £225 or £235.

1053. Why is it that you are so badly treated?—Because of the scale of payment in this district.

1054. Do you think that teachers should be appointed by the Board, or would you advocate the appointment of teachers being made by the General Government?—I think the Board should have the appointment.

1055. Do you think that the Committees should have anything to say in the appointment, removal, and transfer of teachers?—The name of the individual appointed should be sent down to the Committee, and unless they can give a valid reason why he should not be the teacher the appointment should be made.

1056. Do you think that the whole of a pupil-teacher's time should be devoted to teaching?—No; and I also think they should be better fitted before being appointed.

1057. How can that be managed?—By raising the status and delaying appointment for another year or so.

1058. You mean to have a system of probation?—Yes.

1059. But when the child has passed through its term of apprenticeship, what further teaching do you think he or she should have to qualify him or her for the position of a teacher?—I think training-schools should be established, in which pupil-teachers should pass another year, more for the study of the principles of teaching than simply the art of teaching, and put them as far as possible into practice.

1060. I understand you to regard teaching as a science?—Decidedly I do, as well as an art.

1061. Where do you think training-schools should be established?—I think, for economy's sake, in the four large centres; but it seems a great injustice to the smaller districts that we should not have auxiliary schools there too. Yes, I think, everything considered, they should be in the smaller districts as well.

1062. Then, you would have a training-school at Napier?—I decidedly would.

1063. *The Chairman.*] Do you approve of the salaries being regulated by average or roll attendance?—By the average; I cannot see how you can get beyond the average attendance. But in fixing the colonial scale I think that the country schools should receive some consideration, because of the greater number of children that make up the average attendance than in the town schools.

1064. Can you briefly say how you would do that?—Yes; if you consider that 90 would be a fair number at which to appoint additional assistance in town, make it 85 in the country.

Mr. J. CAUGHLEY, Headmaster, Kaikora School, examined.

Mr. Caughley: I consider there is a very urgent need for the colonial scale, not only to readjust the inequalities between district and district, but also to readjust the inequalities within each district. In supporting this second scale that has been offered, I do so on the principle that wherever there is to be an addition to any salary it must come off some other salary, except to the extent that this extra 5s. of capitation will provide for any such addition. I think there is a great deal of fallacy in the belief that reduction in itself is injustice. Looking at the amount of reduction, and the number of reductions, does not give the true idea of the question. Reduction may only be allowing tardy justice. Not only is it not pleasant to make reductions, but it is also unpleasant to leave unchanged those who have been for fifteen years in a deplorable condition. I have every sympathy with that class of teacher (the assistant) who is being reduced most. Even if this question had come up a year ago, I would have looked at it this way: Teachers who hold these positions in the large schools are still as good men as they were under the old conditions; the only fault is that they are in the wrong place. This, in my opinion, is the cause of the trouble, although we must deplore the fact that some teachers are being reduced. The most radical change in this proposed scale is the relative value placed on the assistants' work in large schools as contrasted with the work of head-teachers and assistants in small and medium schools. I will support this change for various reasons, and I wish to bring out in as many places as possible the very much greater importance of a teacher's work as head of a school of 150, compared with any work done by an assistant in a large school. First, I will put it in this way: In a very large school—say, between 850 and 800—there will be at least four or five teachers with fairly high salaries, ranging from £140 to £350. Leaving out the headmaster, there will be three assistants who will get higher salaries than most of the teachers of schools of 100 under the Board's scale. Then, there is the headmaster of this large school, a man with good organizing ability and high certificate, who, instead of getting teachers under him that need his help, gets three assistant masters who are supposed to be more than equal to headmasters of small schools; so that in a large school there are practically four men fitted to be headmasters of schools of from 100 to 120. I say that is not the place where those men should be. If the headmaster of a large school is worthy of his position he does not require such men, and they are required somewhere else. Then, I would also repeat what the last witness said, that even under the new scale and arrangement of staffs there is no school in Hawke's Bay that would have a greater number of pupils per teacher than 55—that is, counting two pupil-teachers equal to one assistant. In estimating the relative value of work we have to consider that the teachers of small schools have generally to direct the efforts of four classes of children, whereas the teachers in large schools have only to take charge of one class. I would like to put it in a practical way. Let me take the subject of arithmetic, for instance: A teacher in a school of about 110 has the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards to teach: An hour and a quarter is allowed for that subject, which will enable the teacher to devote about twenty-five minutes to each class, for it is to be remembered that each standard is in a different stage of the subject. Now, the assistant in a large school has the whole of the hour and a quarter to devote to his one particular standard. Then, again, while this headmaster has to teach these standards, he has to look after the standards at the other

end of the room, and deal with the perplexities of other pupils. With all these claims on his skill I consider that the teacher who has to take syllabus arithmetic for three standards in an hour and a quarter has more calls on him than a teacher of one standard. If the teacher of three standards can pass his pupils at the annual examination as creditably as can the teacher of one standard in a large school, surely the latter is not so highly wrought. It has been said that some teachers who have been in large town schools, and have gone to the country, express a great objection to going back again. I made that statement myself. But the school I was in was in an abnormal state, and many of the remarks made with reference to the Napier School need to be modified on account of that. There were two schools in Napier with pupils up to Standard II., and there were 90 children in Standard VI. in the main school, 120 in the Fifth Standard, 160 in the Fourth, 150 in the Third, and only 80 or 90 in the First, so that many of the upper-standard children came from the other school. The Napier School was what might be called a top-heavy school, and more than ordinary heavy work was thrown on teachers of the upper standards. Therefore, if we condemned any scale by reference to that school, we would be calculating from an abnormal case which does not often exist. The Napier School now will have to depend on the supply of its upper standards from its own infant-school. As has been shown, under the new scale, if the staff is properly distributed, there would not be more than 55 children per teacher, and that would not be too great a strain on any teacher. Then, I would like to put it before you in another phase: In the large school the assistant master or mistress in charge of any standard has his or her class handed up from another teacher, who also has been able to devote undivided attention to that class. Very often in these small schools a class is handed on from a pupil-teacher and that makes, say, the Fourth Standard teaching a great deal more difficult to the teacher in the medium-sized school than to the teacher in the large school, for every one knows how much the work of the upper standards depends on the preparation in the lower. Then, I would put it in another light still: If the assistant mastership of a large school with a salary of £200 became vacant, and the headmaster of a school of 110 became vacant, and it was proposed to exchange these two teachers, which of the two would enter on his new work with the most confidence? The teacher who has been in charge of one class in a large school would know nothing of the organization of a school, but the head master would have very many qualifications as a class-teacher which the assistant never possessed; he would have superior power of discipline. If there is only one class in a room, all are engaged in one kind of work, and consequently there are no distracting influences, therefore it is not so hard for a teacher of one class to keep discipline as for a teacher who has to teach one class and keep order in others. I would also put the matter in another way, in order to support the present proposal to give higher pay to the infant mistress. At present I am in the happy position of having for an infant mistress a lady teacher who for some years had sole charge of a small school. I thereby get the children sent up to me out of the infant-room with a far better groundwork than if I had an assistant from a town school where she had only taught one class. This shows that her training and efficiency gained in the small school are superior to the training gained in a large school. Then, I wish to put it in this light: that it is not to the advantage of children in the higher classes of large schools that they should have these highly paid teachers. I have learned by experience that if I were to go back again to a large school like Napier I should spend a great deal less energy, and leave the pupils to do a great deal more for themselves than I did when I was in that school. A class-teacher in a large school feels bound to be helping the children all the time, whereas in the smaller school he has to give an outline of the principles on which the work is to be based, and leave the pupil to use his own intellect, and this is greatly to his pupil's benefit. So that I consider if there were not this very great preference for the class of teacher now drawn to the large schools it would be for the benefit of large schools, not to their harm. I do not hold these opinions because I am in the class of school that is going to benefit by this scale, but I point out that I actually made a change from a large to a small school when I heard a colonial scale was going to be introduced. I foresaw that if the new scale was going to be sound in principle the salary of the position I then held would in justice have to be reduced, and that the salary of the school for which I was applying would, in like justice, have to be raised. I have, therefore, demonstrated by my actions that I had faith in my opinion. There is another question I should like to refer to besides the question of salaries, and that is the matter of teachers' certificates. Instead of having so many grades of certificates as we have now, I think it would be better if the grades were reduced to four or five. We need not alter the educational attainments that would be required for each one of the five present certificates. With regard to the figure, our departmental scale says that an A5 is equal to an E1. I know which any master would choose. This anomaly is owing to the fact that changes in certificates can be made on two separate lines. When a teacher gets a certificate equal to E he should have two years of experience before he can be promoted. Reference has been made to the ease with which teachers in some districts get their certificates raised by marks from Inspectors compared with the difficulty teachers in other districts have to get such marks; but I think those who made the complaint were at fault in their calculations. They evidently took the total number of teachers in a district, the number promoted in one year, and so arrived at certain results. But in such a reckoning as this we must leave out those teachers in Grade 1, and also those who were raised the year before, for by no manipulation of the regulations can a teacher be raised by an Inspector in two successive years. I will quote to the Commission figures I have here: In Auckland, in 1900, there were 340 teachers eligible for promotion, leaving out those in Grade 1 and those who had their certificates raised the year before; of this number seventy-one were promoted, equal to about 20 per cent. In Taranaki, out of fifty-one eligible, thirteen were promoted, giving 25½ per cent. In Wanganui, out of 108 eligible, thirty-seven were promoted, or 34 per cent., making an average of 22½ per cent. for Wanganui for two years. (When I found that in two successive years there was a great difference I took a third year and found the average.) In Wellington, which seems to be the best district of all for promotion, out of eighty-three eligible nineteen were promoted, or 23 per cent.,

and in the year before 41 per cent. In Hawke's Bay, out of fifty-nine eligible, twenty-two were promoted—22½ per cent.—which is the normal rate. In Marlborough, out of twenty-six eligible, five were promoted, or 19 per cent. In Nelson, out of seventy-three eligible, one was promoted—about 1⅓ per cent.; and this is a district which I believe is quoted as a splendid place for having the certificate raised. The year before, the percentage in Nelson was 12½ per cent. In the Grey District there were twenty-one eligible and one promoted, or 4½ per cent.; the year before it was 10 per cent., and the average for the two years, 7 per cent. In North Canterbury, out of 264 eligible, thirty-nine were promoted, or 14 per cent. In Westland fourteen were eligible and three promoted, or 21½ per cent. In South Canterbury, eighty-five eligible, sixteen promoted, or 18¾ per cent. In Otago, out of 279 eligible, thirty were promoted, or 10¾ per cent.: the year before the percentage was 14. In Southland 115 were eligible, eleven promoted, or 9½ per cent. The normal percentage seems to have been about 20 per cent. The largest percentage is in Wellington, and the lowest in Nelson, Westland being about normal. In making any such reckoning it is necessary to take a fair basis, as I have done here, and not count those teachers who cannot be promoted in the year dealt with. Another instance of wrong calculation is that in preparing the *per capita* cost of teaching children in the different districts the average costs per head for five districts were quoted, and we afterwards find them added together and divided by five to give the average cost per head for those five districts. This is a fallacy; it does not give the average *per capita* cost. If, for the sake of illustration, the *per capita* cost in Westland, where there are few children, were £6 per head, and in Hawke's Bay, where there is a greater number of children, the cost were £4 a head, the average would not be £5. Here is another mistake which has been made. In the first scale the staffing is more liberal, but the salaries are not so high; in the second scale the salaries are more liberal and the staffing is less. In some of the calculations which have been made the staffing has been made on the first scale and the salaries on the second. There is another mistake I would like to correct, and that is in reference to the matter of house allowance. Some people consider that £50 is the equivalent of what a country teacher receives when he gets a house. That is not so. In the country district in which I am living I have a very nice house: it is newly built and nicely furnished, and about as good a schoolhouse as there is in the district; but I could rent one like it in the township for 10s. or 12s. a week, and I am sure that does not represent £50 a year. I might cite another house—the house of a teacher who lives a little distance from me. The total accommodation is three rooms, and no article of furniture larger than a chair can be got inside in less than twenty minutes; the roof you can quite easily touch with your hand. Does a house like that represent £50 a year? There is another matter I would like to refer to in connection with the question of house allowance. Take a school in a bush district where there is a house provided. Perhaps a girl, a young girl who has never left home before, is sent to take charge of that school. She cannot afford to keep a servant, and as a consequence has to live alone; perhaps there may not be another house within a mile of her. If she leaves the house provided for her she has to pay her board, and she gets no house allowance as an equivalent, for the Board prohibits the renting of the house to any other person. The girl has to pay for her board elsewhere, and is unable to rent her house; practically she pays rent twice. Before making the above corrections I was going to refer to the certificate necessary for the different grades of schools. I think it is a mistake that a D1 should be required for a school of an attendance of 100, when only B1 is required for a school with an attendance of 1,020. That means that a teacher, after teaching for the same period, is fit for a school of 100 or for a school of 1,020, since the only difference is literary attainment. Another popular fallacy that needs to be exploded is the idea that prevails that there is a large profit to Education Boards on the large schools in their districts—that they are the gold-mines that make up the deficiency on the smaller schools. In Hawke's Bay District, in a school with an attendance of 775, 74½ per cent. of the capitation grant is spent in salaries; in a school of 482, 77½ per cent.; in a school of 350, 65 per cent.; in a school of 290, 74 per cent.; in a school of 200, 73 per cent.; in a school of 140, 70 per cent. So that, with one exception, all schools from 150 to 775 cost more per head in salaries than a school of 140. The schools that gain most for the Boards are really not the largest schools.

1065. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I understand that you would prefer rent allowance if you could get it rather than a house?—There is rather an objection to a rent allowance. If you give a teacher rent allowance, and there is no schoolhouse, that teacher may be sent to a district where there is no house available. If the teacher had the right to rent the Board's house I think that would be the fairest way.

1066. Is there not a risk of the house being badly treated?—Yes; but the teacher could be held responsible.

1067. Regarding the matter of teachers' certificates, are they not worked out on a ten- or four-years basis, if I remember correctly?—No, I think not; it might be so down South.

1068. You have had experience: did you leave a school down South where you were getting £198 a year for a position worth £186 a year?—Yes, and a house; really it was a rise of about £15 or £20 a year.

1069. Do you consider the work you have here more arduous and responsible than the work you left?—Yes, it taxes me more.

1070. You consider that the salary attaching to a school with 100 pupils should be a better salary than the one attached to the position you left?—Yes.

1071. Regarding the salary of a first assistant in a large school, at what point should the head-teacher in a country school receive the same salary as is paid to a first assistant in a large town school?—The first assistant here gets £280 or £290—I should say, a country school with an attendance of 150 at most.

1072. You consider, all things being equal, that positions in town schools are preferred by the country teachers?—Before I left Napier I expressed the opinion that if I got to be the first assistant in a town school I would not take the headmastership of a country school under £200 a year.

1073. Do you not consider that country teachers should get higher salaries than the town assistants in order to compensate them for the disadvantages they have to undergo?—Yes.

1074. *Mr. Stewart.*] You heard Mr. Watson's evidence?—Yes.

1075. Do you generally approve of the conclusions arrived at by that gentleman?—Yes, I do.

1076. *Mr. Hill.*] What is your opinion as to the method of training pupil-teachers?—I would have to give my opinion as based on the Hawke's Bay pupil-teachers only. I consider that they do not get proper training; too important work is thrust upon them at too early a stage in their career.

1077. Would you suggest that before a pupil-teacher is appointed he should have had some previous training?—That would not be necessary in a large school. I consider I got the best part of my training in a large school through using my eyes and ears. I think no first-year pupil-teacher should go to a small school, only second- or third-year pupil-teachers.

1078. Do you think an arrangement like that would meet the needs of a school between 35 and 75 in average attendance: where an assistant mistress is suggested in the proposed scale, would a third- or fourth-year pupil-teacher do instead of that mistress?—I think such an arrangement would meet the needs of the district, provided a third- or fourth-year pupil-teacher was appointed.

1079. You consider that the staff would be sufficient?—Yes.

1080. On the completion of the pupil-teacher's term, at the end of four years, what would you suggest should be adopted in order to complete the training of that teacher?—I would strongly urge that such pupil-teachers should be sent to a special institution, such as a training-school, in order to get a more extensive view of the work.

1081. You suggest that they should go into a training-college such as in Christchurch, or first such a training-school as we have established at Napier?—I do not consider "first" and "second" to be necessary. I think a practising-school is best. I prefer the local form to the normal school.

1082. Such a school as could be established in every educational district at a small cost?—Yes.

1083. You have had a good deal of experience in the Napier School as an assistant master: is it your opinion that that school is really too large for what you might call efficient working, without duplicating the classes?—I have considered the maximum-sized school should be one of 600 for efficient working.

1084. You think if schools were not allowed to grow beyond that size, if they were cut down to that size—the larger schools—it would be more beneficial not only to the teachers, but to the children?—Yes, I think schools get unwieldy after they reach 600 in attendance.

1085. The efficiency of such schools is not so good?—There is too much of a tendency towards what is called "spoon" teaching.

1086. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Are the Committees in your district satisfied with the allowances made them?—I have seen School Committees' balance-sheets presented at meetings, and there was generally a balance, sometimes a handsome one; it would be exceptional if there were a deficit.

WELLINGTON.

MONDAY, 17TH JUNE, 1901.

C. WATSON, B.A., Headmaster Te Aro School, representing the Wellington Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Watson: The Commission has been through the colony and taken a great deal of evidence, and I feel sure that you must have seen that in very many cases the work of teaching is very much underpaid. A great many peculiar anomalies have no doubt been discovered, both in staffing and salaries, and in the organization of schools. Now, we as teachers are hopeful of very great things from this Commission. We believe it to be the means of making known to the country and Parliament what is actually the state of affairs. The country never has realised its own needs in this matter. Our hope is, knowing as we do that this Commission is composed of experts—men who have been long engaged in the actual work of teaching or in the organizing of teachers—that a scheme will be laid before the House that will give adequate staffing and a proper rate of pay to teachers doing the work. This must necessarily point to much greater expenditure on education. The question arises. Is it likely to be granted? Is this country in a position to do so? We feel sure that when a democratic country like this realises that it has not an educational system such as it ought to have it will not grudge expenditure in that direction. If we want to improve our position in the matter of education, to bring ourselves, as near as our means and circumstances will admit, into line with other progressive parts of the world, we must do it by comparing ourselves not merely with the parts of the world that we know have not advanced beyond ourselves, but we must, if possible, compare ourselves with some of the best equipped. We must get what we know in the light of modern educational reading and thought to be a right system. For that reason I think it would be unwise to compare ourselves, for instance, with the Australian Colonies. They have had special difficulties to contend with, and I do not think they can claim that their educational systems have progressed as in other parts of the world. Therefore I think it is unwise for us to try to take our lead from them. As I have said, there have been special reasons that have influenced the neighbouring colonies. Ten years ago, for instance,

they went through a time of unexampled financial depression, from which they were many years recovering; but I think it is safe to say, regarding what is taking place over there now, that within a few years the neighbouring colonies will make very great changes and very great advances in their educational systems. I propose to lay before you to-day a few figures taken from the London School Board's report (Exhibit 92), showing the pay of teachers in schools of about equal size with those here. I will now ask the Commission to allow me to read the report which the Committee of the Wellington Educational Institute has drawn up on the proposed colonial scale of salaries: "Teachers of this district and teachers generally believe that the people of this colony desire to see the position of the teacher rendered as attractive as possible. In order to secure this end three reforms are necessary—a curtailed syllabus, capable of being thoroughly and satisfactorily worked, adequate staffing of schools, and adequate remuneration to competent teachers. We are hopeful that an amended curtailed syllabus will soon be issued, and it forms no part of our present business to discuss it. Evidently it is of the first importance that adequate staffing of schools should be arranged for, so that teachers will not be called upon to do what is physically beyond the power of the average teacher to undertake without undue strain. The original scheme as issued by the Inspector-General provided for a staff which no doubt was numerically inadequate. There remains the weighty question of the remuneration of those who are engaged in what, by general consent, we must consider this most important work of teaching. The rate of pay will in the long-run determine the class and calibre of the teachers in the schools. It is apparent that statements by public men, however true they may be—as to the nobility, and importance, and responsibility of the office of the teacher—will not in themselves attract the class of men and women who will be best qualified to train the youth of the community. Such men and women will evidently expect that the reward of their labour will bear some proportion to its responsibility and importance. The reputed dignity of the office will not draw to it a capable youth who realises that, during the four (or six) years of preparation, he will receive less than an apprentice to a trade, and that on the completion of his apprenticeship he will receive less salary—£50 or £70 less—than if he were a journeyman tradesman; added to this, he does not forget the uncertainties and delays in promotion, nor, if he is well informed, the frequent irritating schemes of retrenchment. Women also, it is clear, having to undergo the same preparation as men, and having duties as arduous to perform, should have possibilities of promotion, and possibilities of a career, which will draw to the work the brightest and ablest of our high-school girls. The following resolutions were arrived at by the Committee: That no colonial scale can be deemed satisfactory which does not embody a pension scheme for teachers who are retired after long service; that the Commission be asked to arrange for the separate payment for tuition of pupil-teachers; that, seeing the great majority of the schools of the colony are provided with residences, and that no account is taken of this fact in the proposed scheme, it is urgent, in order to secure an equitable colonial scale of salaries, that distinct provision be made for a reasonable house allowance when no house is provided; that £100 be the minimum salary for certificated women and £110 for men; that the rate of pay for women should bear a fair proportion to that for men; that instead of rating men and women assistants as first, second, third, fourth, fifth, &c., the men should be rated as first, second, third, &c., male assistants, and the women as first, second, and third female assistants; that the position of infant mistress should not appear in the scale until there is an infant department of 150 in average attendance; that there should not be infant-schools under separate management unless the average attendance is 250, and that no child should be retained in such school after the age of seven years; that in no school shall the average number of children per teacher exceed 40." I wish to say one or two words on these resolutions. We are strongly of opinion that there should be a pension scheme, and that tuition of pupil-teachers should be specially paid for. It is a great hardship for a teacher to have to do that out of his salary. With regard to the house allowance, looking at the scheme put in in Mr. Hogben's evidence, it would mean that every teacher of a large school in this town, if he received no house allowance, would lose from £30 to £50, except in the case of two teachers, who have larger schools. I think it is hardly likely that the Board would be able to pay house allowance out of its allowances—it would amount in this district to something like £1,600 for house allowance; in the Auckland District it would be a great deal more. Therefore we think the house allowance should be distinct. If you are to put the teachers on anything like an equality you must make a distinct provision for house allowance in every case. In fixing the minimum salary at £100 for certificated women and £110 for men, we were guided chiefly by recognition of the fact that it costs the women as much to live as the men, and in the first grades probably neither has more dependent on him or her: a man has not more dependent on him than a woman, but, on account of the fact that a large percentage of women leave the service, it seems advisable to give a little extra inducement to the men to attract them into the service. Unless something like that is done, it will happen that the men will very largely disappear from the teaching profession. With regard to the resolution about rating men and women assistants as first, second, third, &c., it is convenient in most of the larger schools—in fact, it is almost necessary—that we should have a couple of men assistants. If they take the first and second places it leaves no positions worth having for the women under any such scale as the printed one. We also find that in these large schools we require well-paid women in the standard part of the school as well as men, whereas under the scale put in in evidence the infant mistress would come in as the best-paid woman, and that would leave no woman having a fair position on the standard part of the staff. We think it would be easier and fairer, perhaps, if the staffs were arranged as we suggest in the resolution: "The position of infant mistress should not appear until there is an average of 150 in the infant department." We hold that in an ordinary school the woman in charge of the lower part of the school is something on the footing of an ordinary assistant; but a little too much attention is directed to the infant mistress's position by making the infant mistress come in in such a prominent position as she does under the scale. The effect would be to largely divert all women's attention to training

for infant work, leaving none who had specially qualified themselves for the standard work. More than that, it might lead to a little difficulty in the management of schools. The infant mistress would come in as appointed, and she would consider that as her special work; whereas where there are not separate departments the head of the school should have complete control of the staff. Putting the infant mistress in such a very decided position might lead to friction. "That there should not be separate infant-schools until the average attendance is 250": We put that in on the ground that it does not do to establish small separate schools, because they are more expensive to work. Then, perhaps, it might be advisable in certain cases—it has been so in other parts of the world—to establish a separate independent infant-school. We feel strongly that the staffing should be based on an average of 40 per teacher, and not more; and we are hoping that when we get a scheme such as is worthy of the colony the pupil-teacher will disappear as a member of the staff, very nearly or quite. It is so in the great educational districts at Home—the London schools are staffed almost throughout without pupil-teachers. The increase of expenditure would not be very great. Our hope is, then, that pupil-teachers will be reduced in number to a much greater extent than has appeared under any scale that we have yet seen. I will not detain the Commission longer, but am prepared to answer any questions.

1. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You have not seen the alternative scale?—Up to only about 300, and as it appeared in the *Journal of Education*.

2. May I take it that you approve of it?—It is not such a scale as I hope the Commission will lay before the country.

3. As regards teachers, how do you think that scale would affect them?—As to staffing, the numbers are rather too large for teachers, and there are more pupil-teachers than I think there should be.

4. And with regard to salary?—I really cannot remember just now.

5. You know the scale of salaries that obtains in Otago?—Yes.

6. If that applied to the whole colony would it meet your wishes as to pay?—Yes, I think we should be satisfied.

7. Would 1,000 be too many in a school?—Personally, I am of the opinion that they should not be allowed to grow as large as that; but I do not think I express the opinion of my Institute in saying so.

8. You said that the minimum wage for women should be £100, and for men £110: do you not think that up to a certain point men and women should be paid alike?—The reason why we differentiate is this: you want to hold out a little extra inducement to men, because after you have trained women a great many of them leave.

9. Is it not because they do not get as much as men that they leave: if they were given £10 more would they leave?—That would keep more of them in the service, but the fact remains that a great many marry and leave.

10. If they would prefer to marry to teaching, the difference in salary would not induce them to remain?—I think not; it would to some extent, but very little.

11. You see, a woman requires the same qualifications and has to obtain the same results in a small school as a man?—We recognise that.

12. Still, you think there ought to be a difference of £10?—Yes.

13. With regard to the possibility of promotion, would you not give a woman charge of, we will say, the Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth Standards?—Very often it would be convenient to do so.

14. You would leave that at the discretion of the head-teacher?—I think the arrangement of the staff should be left entirely in the head-teacher's hands.

15. You approve of his having the right, if he sees exceptional qualifications, to give a woman charge of the Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth Standards?—Yes, certainly.

16. With regard to smaller schools, what number would you intrust to a woman to have control of, with assistants?—I would not limit the number at all.

17. Would you allow the position of head-teacher to be quite as open for women as for men, say, in a school of from 60 to 100?—Yes.

18. Higher still?—Yes, I think so; up to any point.

19. With regard to the difference of payment between men and women, what would you make it, say, in a school of 200?—In discussing the matter between ourselves, I think both men and women agreed that it would be something like fair if in the higher salaries you paid the women 75 per cent. of the men's salaries, the lower salaries about 80 per cent., and the lowest 90 per cent.; 25 per cent. difference is, I think, the amount we arrived at in regard to the higher salaries.

20. Are you in favour of paying a woman the same as a bachelor?—I do not see how you could inquire into every individual case like that.

21. Do you believe in the classification of teachers?—Not too complicated a system.

22. But you believe in a classification?—My opinion is that it should be a teacher's certificate straight out. A man who has that should be recognised by the colony as competent to take charge of a school; but he should be graded for his length of service. Any additional classification he may get in the way of degrees is to his benefit in obtaining promotion.

23. Have you thought of any method of promoting—how it is to be brought about, whether by Board or by Government?—At present I should not propose to alter the Board arrangement.

24. Is it not a fact that a teacher in a country district has not anything like the same chance of promotion as a town teacher?—In this district I think he has a better chance.

25. Take a vacancy occurring in the town: would a country teacher have an equal chance with a town teacher?—In the present temper of the Board he would have a better chance.

26. Are the teachers appointed by the Board?—Yes, but the Committees have the right of objecting.

27. Do you think, if a colonial scale were brought in, that the Inspectors should be under one authority, or remain under the Boards as at present?—Under the central authority.

28. Then, that would do away with the work of a Board?—I cannot see that.

29. If an Inspector were a colonial officer and not under the control of a Board, is it not a fact that their being deprived of his services would interfere very much with the Board's existence?—I can hardly see that. He would be there to advise them, as now.

30. With regard to a superannuation allowance, do you think teachers would be prepared to contribute in order to provide for such an allowance?—I suppose that would be necessary—that some sort of contribution should be made.

31. Do you think that a great deal of dissatisfaction exists amongst teachers regarding the management of teachers at schools?—There is an apprehension of continued reductions among them.

32. You think that a colonial scale would obviate that?—I hope so.

33. But do not the reductions really come about on account of attendance?—I suppose diminished attendance does affect salaries, but not in this district. The average has risen every year in this district.

34. It was the Government that reduced the capitation from £4 to £3 15s.?—Yes; but since that reduction there have been further reductions by the Boards.

35. In consequence of opening new schools?—Partly that.

36. Do you think that if the Government had had the expenditure of the money that has been expended by this Board they would have done better for the teachers than the Board has done?—I think it is probable.

37. Speaking from experience, you say that if the same funds had been in the hands of the Government they would have been more satisfactorily spent in connection with the schools than they have been by the Board?—I do not know that they would in the past; but we have this fear: that now the Boards have power to spend money on manual and technical instruction, that will absorb a large amount.

38. *Mr. Davidson.*] I understand that it is unsatisfactory that there should be thirteen different scales of staff and salaries under our present national system of education?—Yes, I think the teachers throughout the colony feel that.

39. Do you think that dissatisfaction exists amongst teachers owing to the great inequality at present obtaining regarding the different payments in the different districts?—No doubt there is a very bitter feeling in some districts that they are much worse off than others.

40. And, in your opinion, a colonial scale of staff and salaries would remove these inequalities, and in that way remove the dissatisfaction?—Certainly.

41. Here is a copy of the proposed alternative scale: do you notice in it that in schools of from 14 to 19 the suggested salary is the same for either sex?—Yes.

42. That is to say, that it ranges from a minimum of £75 to a maximum of £100 for schools up to 19?—Yes; we do not think that any certificated teacher should be asked to serve for £75 a year.

43. Do you think that the country can afford a larger capitation grant than £5 for schools under 14 in average attendance?—I can hardly answer as to whether the country can afford it, but you could not ask a good man to work for less salary than that.

44. Then, would you not limit the attendance at a school before you would pay £100?—That is a question for a politician rather than for me. If the country cannot afford it, then it must be done.

45. You know that in some districts there are schools with an average attendance of 2?—I do not think you can call them schools.

46. They are called schools; and if your suggested salary of £100 were granted there it would mean a cost of £50 a head?—Of course, that is impossible.

47. Then, if we are to carry out your suggestion we must limit the number of pupils that will constitute a school?—Certainly; that is all a question of colonial expenditure.

48. Do you know that in the Australian Colonies schools under a certain average attendance are called "provisional schools"?—I am not familiar with the Australian system.

49. Do you approve of the provision in this suggested scale for paying men and women equally up to £100?—Yes.

50. Do you notice that in the next grade—19 to 40—the suggested salary ranges from £120 to £160 for men, and from £102 to £144 for women?—Yes.

51. That suggested salary for women is considerably better than the salary for such grade of school in any part of the colony at the present time?—Yes, I think that is so.

52. Do you know what percentage of the schools in the colony are in the class below 40 in average attendance?—I cannot quote the figure, but I could very soon find out.

53. You are aware, probably, that about 62 per cent., or nearly a thousand schools in the colony are below 40 in average attendance?—You are more familiar with the figures than I am.

54. Suppose all schools up to 40 in average attendance were thrown open to either sex, and the salaries were equalised, do you think it would be in the interests of the women teachers to equalise salaries up to that point; or, in other words, do you not think it probable that a married man with a wife and family, perhaps, would be preferred to a single woman?—I think that in open competition that would be so.

55. Then, in the interests of women, up to that point you would reduce the disparity between the salaries, but not equalise them?—For special reasons we do not think it is advisable to equalise the salaries.

56. Then, as to the staff allowed, would you admit to the staff a thoroughly qualified assistant teacher when the average attendance reached 40?—I think that this country ought to do without pupil-teachers altogether.

57. You know that in Wellington the staff of a school between 40 and 75 consists of a head-teacher and a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

58. Do you think that staff is sufficiently liberal?—No.

59. You think that with an attendance of 75 a school is too heavy for a teacher and a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

60. Then, you prefer the suggested scale, under which a thoroughly qualified assistant would take from the headmaster the work of the infants and Standards I. and II., to the present Wellington scale?—Certainly; anything is preferable that puts an assistant in the place of a pupil-teacher.

61. Do you consider that at an average attendance of 90, three teachers—*i.e.*, a head-teacher, a mistress, and a pupil-teacher—or an average of one to 30, is sufficient?—Yes.

62. You objected to the title "infant mistress" as adding probably too much importance or dignity to the position of the woman occupying that place in the school?—I do not wish to detract from anybody's importance, but it will lead to complications in this way: You appoint two assistants to a school—one an infant mistress. It might be found more convenient to put her to some other part of the work, and the other one in charge of the infants. I think the headmaster of the school should have full control of his staff. As to the infant mistress, I should like to remind the Commission that women are specially qualified for this work—teaching infants.

63. Do you know that in Otago the title given to the woman occupying the position provided for here is "mistress," not "infant mistress"?—That is better.

64. And do you know that the head-teachers in Otago claim the right and exercise the right of placing the mistress or assistants in any position they think fit?—I think that is only right; the head of the school should have control.

65. So you would suggest that, instead of "infant mistress," probably the term "mistress" would be better?—Yes; partly for the reason I have stated, and also because the present system draws the attention of women to preparing for infant work much more than it should. We want some women to look forward to taking a good position in the ordinary standard work.

66. You recognise that, now that kindergarten work, and modelling, and so on have been introduced into the infant department, the position of infant mistress is an exceedingly important one?—Yes, it is as important as any other; but we do not wish the other positions to be lost sight of.

67. It has been stated in evidence in different parts of the colony that the average woman is physically, not mentally, unfit to take charge of a large standard class in a city school above the Third Standard; that the physical strain is so great that the average woman is unable to bear it: what is your opinion on that point?—I cannot quite say I indorse that. You will find women in this district teaching boys' classes up to the Fifth and Sixth Standards.

68. But mixed classes only?—Mixed classes of boys and girls in the Sixth Standard. I prefer to get a man for the upper classes, for the reason that outside the school he is of very great assistance in the government of a school; but I must admit that I have had the work inside the school done as well by women as men.

69. Do you not think it would be a wise provision, then, to allow such elasticity in the scale that the second or third assistant might be a female—*i.e.* that an exceptional woman may be placed there?—I think it entirely desirable.

70. Then, you would not have the alternation suggested in the scale?—We object to that.

71. You would make provision that a woman might be placed in the position?—We should like to have the staff arranged as I stated—*i.e.*, first, second, third, &c., male assistants; and first, second, &c., female assistants.

72. You know that in many large schools the women on the staff are in charge of the infants, First, Second, and Third Standards; and the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards are in charge of men?—If you can get the men, of course they can do the work.

73. You would approve of such a scheme as would make it possible for exceptional women to occupy exceptional positions?—Decidedly.

74. Have you heard that, according to the alternative scale, all assistants throughout the colony would be brought up to the rate paid in Otago or Canterbury, whichever was the higher?—Yes.

75. Do you approve of the assistants being paid at a much higher rate than that suggested in the first scale?—Yes, I should like to see that carried out.

76. Do you know whether the Wellington Education Board has a scale of staffing and salaries?—Yes.

77. Do you know whether or not the Board strictly adheres to its scale of salaries?—I suppose it does in making appointments; but those who have had a certain salary have very often kept it when circumstances have made it above the scale.

78. Though there is a scale in this district, the Board does not adhere to it?—Certainly not—not rigidly.

79. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you wish the Commission to understand that, from your knowledge, the scale which is at present part of the rules and regulations of the Wellington Board is not kept to?—It is not enforced.

80. In what way is it not enforced?—New appointments are made under the scale, but, as far as I understand, there are two or three scales that have been made at different times; those appointed under one scale are still receiving payment under that scale.

81. What has been the main cause of dissatisfaction amongst teachers in the Wellington District?—We are all, as I have already answered, under great apprehensions that we shall be seriously reduced in future.

82. Why is that?—As I have said, under the Manual and Technical Instruction Act the Boards can spend, legally, as much as they like on manual and technical instruction.

83. Under the new Act?—Yes; and under the old Act too.

84. For how long have the funds been taken for manual and technical instruction?—You can get that information from the Board's officers. Our opinion is that it will be in that way that the money will be likely to go.

85. Your contention is this: that it is necessary, in the interests of primary education, that payment of teachers should be separate from the other elements of the Board's finance?—Yes, I think so.

86. Do you think that would be one effect of a colonial scale?—I hope so.

87. With regard to pupil-teachers' examinations, you say that you would like to see the disappearance of pupil-teachers altogether in the arrangement of teachers?—As a part of the staff.

88. If such a drastic measure as that were taken at once, would it not affect the supply of teachers in the future to some extent?—I would still have pupil-teachers spend part of their time in a school, but not be part of the staff. That is the plan adopted by all the best Education Boards in England.

89. Are you aware that the order of reference to this Commission distinctly limits it to the £4 capitation?—No.

90. Do you think it would be possible for this Commission to recommend such a scheme as that in the face of the order of reference?—I am afraid not.

91. How about the supply of male pupil-teachers in this district?—There are practically none, or, at any rate, a very small proportion.

92. What do you put this down to?—Mr. Webb will give you figures which seem to me to entirely account for it; those figures show that after a youth has served an apprenticeship to the teaching, and spent four or five years at it, he is worse off than if he had gone into a Government department, and the chances are he will be out of employment for a year, perhaps more, when his apprenticeship is over.

93. You think that is the sole cause?—That and the pay that he gets as a pupil-teacher. As a matter of fact, this week two young fellows who have been two or three years in this district told me that they were going out of the service.

94. With regard to infant mistresses: is it your contention that the position of first lady assistant should be the most important position—in a large school should the first lady assistant occupy the most important position of the female teachers?—Yes.

95. Do you think that the Commission should put it in this way: that the first lady assistant and the infant mistress should have an equal status in the school—at any rate, as far as pay is concerned?—I think that might be so; it is hard to deal with. I find that it about comes to that in the great Board districts at Home; the woman at the head of a large girls' department is on an equality with a woman at the head of an infant department, and I do not see why it should not be so here.

96. Is this your contention with regard to the position of an infant mistress: that if a head-teacher finds by experience that he has a teacher more adapted to the work than the infant mistress he should have the power of placing that teacher in charge?—Yes.

97. In the interests of the children, that power should be vested in the headmaster?—Yes, I think so.

98. That might cause some friction if there were any difference in the salaries?—Yes.

99. If a certain salary was attached to the infant mistress's position it might be a very inconvenient thing to give the headmaster that power?—When the infant mistress appeared as a special servant on the staff it might, perhaps, not be advisable to attempt to interchange her.

100. Is it recognised as a matter of right in your district that the first male assistant should have charge of Standard VI.?—Yes, because he is always the best-paid servant in the school.

101. Would you, as a headmaster, not have the power, under special circumstances, to say to your assistant that he should take, say, Standard IV.?—Yes, I have that power, and exercise it.

102. Then, as a matter of fact, there is no vested right?—No.

103. As a matter of principle, are the teachers thoroughly agreed upon a colonial scale?—I think so, as a whole.

104. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the salaries under the suggested scale with the scale in the Wellington District?—Yes.

105. How do they compare—favourably or otherwise?—The men teachers would lose throughout, considerably.

106. In which case? Take your own school?—If I had no house allowance I would lose about £50.

107. Does the salary stated in the return to the Minister for the year 1900—viz., £370—embrace house allowance?—Yes, £50 house allowance.

108. Consequently your salary would otherwise be £320?—Yes.

109. Have you noticed what it would be under the suggested scale?—About £313.

110. What is the average attendance at your school?—It varies from about 490 to 530—say, 510.

111. The first assistant is getting £220: according to the scale in Otago he would get more than that?—Yes.

112. And the other teachers accordingly—*i.e.*, according to the suggested scale No. 2. Would any material alteration require to be made in the staff of your school in the event of the adoption of the suggested plan?—Not in the first case; in the second case the building would have to be altered

113. You have seven assistants and five pupil-teachers?—Yes, at present.

114. Do you consider that if the Wellington Education Board got the extra allowance of 5s. —*i.e.*, to bring the capitation from £3 15s. to £4—they would be able to pay salaries equal to those laid down in the suggested scale?—Possibly the Wellington Education Board might, but the smaller Boards could not.

115. You stated that you are in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.

116. For the reasons that you gave?—Largely as a matter of loyalty to the teachers throughout the colony. The larger Board districts would not feel the effect as the others would.

117. You said that no scale would be complete unless provision were made for pensions: are the teachers, then, prepared to reject the suggested scale because it does not make such provision? —I do not think so.

118. For the most part your arguments were in opposition to a colonial scale. You pointed out the defects and the weaknesses of the suggested scale?—No; we are not at all opposed to a colonial scale. I was not aware that the order of reference of this Commission bound it down to dispensing only £4 capitation. We were hoping that the Commission would draw up an ideal scheme.

119. The Commission can only make a recommendation to Parliament: there is no guarantee that the recommendation we make will be adopted?—We are aware of that.

120. Do you consider that the minimum certificates required here according to the suggested scale are too high?—No; but there would have to be a discount for existing cases. I think that the percentage of reduction for those who are not up to the standard is an unwise hardship in many cases.

121. You consider that part of the proposed colonial scale should only be brought into operation when fresh appointments are made?—That is so.

122. Do you consider a teacher should lose £10 when a sewing-mistress is appointed?—Certainly not.

123. Nor that a teacher should lose a ratio of his salary when an assistant is appointed? —No.

124. I suppose you are aware that such obtains in another education district?—No, I am not.

125. With regard to pupil-teachers, do you consider that the salaries proposed to be paid to pupil-teachers according to this scale are sufficient?—No; I think they should be a little better.

126. You consider that the pupil-teachers in this district are in excess of the number that should be?—Yes.

127. Would you advocate, then, the substitution of an assistant for two pupil-teachers where practicable?—I think that should be done where practicable.

128. Do you find that in this district the female teachers largely preponderate?—In the greater number of country schools the head-teachers are men.

129. Does the Board give preference to female teachers?—The salary is less.

130. Is that the reason why the Board employs a larger number of females?—I suppose so.

131. Would preference be given to women also so that they may be able to teach sewing?— There would have to be a number of women in every case.

132. If the salaries were equalised, and this "economical" reason disappeared, would not males be appointed to vacancies which females get, and consequently fewer females be employed by the Board?—Yes, I think that would be the result.

133. What would you consider a fair differentiation between the salaries of male and female teachers?—About 75 per cent. for the higher salaries, 80 per cent. for the lower, and 90 per cent. for the lowest.

134. You mean 10 per cent. difference in the lower salaries, up to 25 per cent. in the highest salaries?—Yes.

135. With regard to pupil-teachers' examinations, do you consider that there should be uniformity of examinations for pupil-teachers throughout the colony, instead of allowing each Board to make its own regulations?—I think it would be advisable.

136. Do you consider there should be training-colleges established in the four large centres of population, and provision made for the training of pupil-teachers in the other centres?—I think we should have to come to some arrangement of the sort.

137. You advocated that a subsidy should be paid to head-teachers for the instruction of pupil-teachers?—Where they have to do it. I should advocate that in the large centres the pupil-teachers should be taught together, as is done in this district.

138. Do you consider, then, that the system adopted in this district is working satisfactorily? —Fairly so; I think it could be made to work entirely satisfactorily.

139. How many hours a day do you consider that a pupil-teacher starting his or her career should be required to actually teach in a school?—I do not think he or she should teach more than half the week.

140. Three hours a day?—Yes, or perhaps two days and a half in the week; the other days should be devoted to study. That is the practice in many large districts in England.

141. Do you consider that male and female pupil-teachers should be paid alike?—Not quite.

142. You notice that under the suggested scale it is proposed to pay them alike?—Yes. As we say, we want some special inducement to keep men in the profession.

143. Are bonuses paid on teachers' certificates in this district?—Yes—*i.e.*, you get better pay according to your certificates.

144. Do females participate to the same extent as males?—Yes, I suppose so, in proportion.

145. Do they not get actually the same amount of bonus on similar certificates as the males?— I am sorry to say I do not know.

146. Do you not consider that if bonuses are adopted, seeing that a female teacher has just the same examination to pass and the same work to do as a male, she should be entitled to the same amount of bonus?—Yes, I think so.

147. Do you think Inspectors should be placed under the central department?—Yes, they should.

148. You consider, I suppose, that that would lead to greater uniformity of inspection and examination?—Yes, it would certainly tend in that direction.

149. With regard to the work to be done as laid down in the syllabus, do you consider that there should be a differentiation between the work expected to be done in a country school, where the teacher is unaided, and what might be expected in a large, fully staffed town school?—Yes, certainly.

150. In which direction—not, I suppose, in the main subjects of the syllabus?—There should be more "options" in the class-subjects.

151. With regard to the maintenance fund, has the Wellington Board withdrawn maintenance funds for building purposes or for repairs of buildings?—I can hardly tell you.

152. I notice here, for example, that their receipts by way of capitation and from the Land Commissioners for the year 1899 were £45,189, whereas they only paid £39,204 in teachers' salaries?—We have looked through the Public Accounts, but cannot make head or tail of them.

153. You do not know what they did with the difference?—No.

154. With regard to side-schools, do you favour the establishment of side-schools outside the larger town schools?—I have not given much attention to that.

155. Do you favour the separation of the sexes in the larger schools?—No.

156. You consider, I suppose, that the schools can be worked much more economically when the sexes are not separated?—More economically.

157. Do you consider that the adoption of a colonial scale of staff and salaries would in any way tend to weaken the power and influence of Education Boards?—I do not see why it should. Their authority over us lies in their power of appointing and dismissing us. They would still have to pay the salaries. The only thing taken from them would be arranging the salary.

158. Do you consider that greater facilities should be given for the transfer and promotion of teachers?—Yes; I think that might be advisable, but it would be difficult to arrange under the Board's system.

159. Do you consider the working-average percentage — viz., 50 per cent. — is too low?—It hardly affects the town schools at all.

160. Do you consider that a teacher's salary should be based on the average attendance as at present, on the roll-number, or on the highest number present?—I suppose the fairest way is to take the average all round.

161. It should be based on the previous quarter's attendance — or, say, on the previous four quarters?—A half-year is perhaps the best compromise.

162. Would you favour an increase by individual units?—No; by grades.

163. You consider there would be a tendency, where you were getting near the top of a grade limit, to stuff the roll?—There would be a certain temptation; I do not think, though, that it would happen—very rarely, at any rate.

164. With regard to the alterations that have been made in the Wellington scale, I suppose they have all been more or less in the direction of reduction?—Take my own case as an example: Twenty years ago I was appointed to a school of 300 on my present salary. I have now 500, and have received a notice that my salary is above the scale.

165. *Mr. Hill.*] You are well acquainted with the scale in operation in this district?—It is rather hard to make the scale out.

166. I have a scale here called "Scale of Staffing": are your acquainted with that scale?—Yes.

167. Do you think that the staffing proposed in that scale is sufficient?—No; there are too many pupil-teachers.

168. Is that the only defect it has?—Numerically the staffing is fair.

169. Take the case of a school between 151 and 180—"one head-teacher, one female assistant, and three pupil-teachers": do you think you could work a school efficiently on that staff?—No; there are too many pupil-teachers.

170. Not sufficient assistants?—Certainly not.

171. Have you compared the scale to which we are now referring with the scale suggested by the Inspector-General?—Yes.

172. Which is the more favourable to the staffing of the schools?—The proposed scale.

173. Take a school of the size I have mentioned: what would be the staffing of that school under the proposed scale?—Three adults and two pupil-teachers.

174. Take a school of between 511 and 550, and make a comparison: which scale is the more favourable?—The proposed one.

175. Now, with regard to the salaries of head-teachers, have you compared the salaries proposed to be paid under the suggested scale with those paid by your Board?—Yes.

176. Take a school of from 15 to 20: would the teacher benefit under the proposed scale?—It is impossible to give you a general answer; in some cases the teachers would, and in some they would not. The teachers of the main class of country schools in this district would lose heavily.

177. The teachers of all schools up to 30 would benefit very materially?—Possibly so in the very small schools.

178. Then, all the teachers in schools of between 35 and 200 would lose?—Yes.

179. The salaries begin to approximate between that and 300. I notice that the salaries under your scale vary materially. Take the case of the Thorndon School: the headmaster gets £370,

the average attendance being 406; then at the Clyde Quay School the headmaster gets £360, the average attendance being 713; then we have your case, with an average attendance of 525 you get £370: what is the reason of these differences?—The Board pays a maximum salary when the school is over 300 in average attendance. Then, again, some of us were appointed twenty years ago, when there was a better scale in operation.

180. You mean to say that when a new scale was adopted certain teachers who had been receiving payment on a higher scale were left alone?—Yes; we were not affected.

181. That accounts, then, for the varying salaries that obtain in certain cases?—Yes, to a large extent; they have not been reduced to the new scale.

182. Your salaries, I understand, are paid on average attendance and certificates held?—Yes.

183. Do you believe in the principle of paying a man's salary on the certificate he holds instead of the work he does?—No, I do not. I have said that I think there should be a teacher's certificate.

184. And that certificate should qualify him to hold any position in the service?—There must be grades in it to express length of service, and after a certain length of service a teacher should be qualified to hold any position.

185. When a certificate is issued to the captain of a ship, does it qualify him to command a big or a little ship?—Any ship.

186. Well, then, should the certificate entitle a teacher to hold any position—to be the head of a large or small school?—I think it should say that he is a certificated teacher, and that should be sufficient.

187. Then, all things being equal, he should be able to make application for any position?—Yes.

188. I understood you to say that a woman's work in a school is equal to that of a man: has that been your experience?—I have had the upper-standard work done admirably by women.

189. You are satisfied that with proper training a woman could manage a school like a man if she were put to it?—Yes, I think so, in many cases.

190. You are aware, I suppose, that women do manage and control schools in the Old Country?—Yes.

191. There are girls' schools there in which men do not teach?—No; in the girls' departments in London there are no men teachers.

192. A woman has to pass the same examinations as a man?—Yes.

193. You said that in some cases women can do the work as well as men?—Decidedly.

194. If a woman in competition with a man does the work as well, would you give her the same salary?—No; you pay a man on the ground that he has a household to support; and you do not expect that generally in the case of women.

195. Do you not think that many women leave in consequence of being ill-paid, and are glad to get married in consequence?—I hardly think so.

196. Do you not think the women would prefer to continue teaching if they had a good salary?—No doubt, the higher the salaries the greater the tendency would be for them to stay.

197. Then, they would become more efficient and valuable to the State, would they not?—Undoubtedly.

198. Would you not, therefore, offer a woman a larger salary—say, equal to that of a man—and if the people choose to select a woman, let them do so? I am taking the case of a small school, say, up to 30 in average attendance: would you not pay a woman the same salary as a man if she were in charge of such a school—she has as much responsibility?—As far as responsibility goes, yes.

199. Does she not want to save and anticipate old age, like a man?—One objection is that it would inevitably tend to make the salary to fit a woman. If you are going to fix a salary on the basis of man's pay, I do not mind your making a woman's salary equal to a man's.

200. Suppose it were to be decided that schools below 30 were to be in the charge of women, do you think that would be a good thing for the country? If a man chose to go there he would, of course, get a woman's salary?—That is to say, you would fix the salaries attaching to those schools on a woman's rate, not a man's rate. I have no objection to their being thrown open to women at all as long as you make the rate of pay that of a man.

201. Do you suggest that men should have charge of schools of, say, from 20 to 44 in average attendance — that a scale should be provided for men? — I do not see any need to confine it to men.

202. You believe in a salary suitable for a certain position, so that women could have it as well as men?—I have no objection to positions being open to competition.

203. With regard to the control of schools, your opinion is, I understand, that the headmaster of a school should be the controller?—Yes; the headmaster or the mistress, as the case may be.

204. The headmaster should be able to distribute his staff as he thinks proper?—Yes.

205. The very fact of his being the headmaster implies that a man has a full knowledge of infant-training as well as standard work?—I suppose so.

206. You would give him full control of the staff, so that if he thought proper at any time to rearrange his staff so as to take the headmistress of the school, say, from the girls' department to take charge of the infants he could do so?—Yes.

207. The full control should be in the hands of the headmaster?—Certainly.

208. Then, under such circumstances, would not the assistants become class-teachers?—I do not quite see the drift of your question.

209. Do not your separate teachers have almost equal responsibility in your school?—Yes, nearly.

210. And the classes which they have to teach are pretty nearly equal to one another?—Yes; they vary more or less.

211. What I am after is the question of salaries: would you not approximate the assistants' salaries more closely than they are at preseut?—No.

212. You would still differentiate the salaries?—Yes; it is usual in all departments that as you go along you shall get to a better position.

213. But supposing the various class-teachers have equal certificates, what then? I notice that at your school you have a number of highly classed teachers: supposing they all had the same certificates, would you differentiate their salaries very much?—Take the first assistant: it is generally considered that only a man well up in reputation in the district would get the position of first assistant.

214. Yes, I can understand about the first assistant; but what about the staffing lower down? Would you approximate the salaries?—I think there should be a gradation, and that it should be a recognised thing that the higher positions should go to the more experienced or better teachers.

215. Are you satisfied with the salaries offered in the suggested scale?—No; they are discouraging for male teachers, on the whole.

216. You think some amendment is wanted in the salaries suggested?—Yes; my male staff would lose.

217. With reference to the average attendance, do you think that the teachers would prefer to be paid on the number present during any one week rather than on the average attendance?—I do not think we have ever given attention to it. I think it would not be a wise plan.

218. Give us your reason for saying so?—You may have a very large attendance some day. Your average attendance gives you a fair estimate of the number of children that a teacher generally has to teach.

219. Your staff is the same when that large attendance is present as at other times?—Yes.

220. And they are present every other day when there is a lower attendance?—Yes.

221. Do you think that, being present, and thus showing their desire to work, teachers should not suffer for the absence of the children: they have to teach the larger number when the attendance is greater than usual?—True; but, taking it all round, there is not very much difference between one day's attendance and another's. I think it is a fair way to pay—as at present.

222. If your boy went to a private school you would have to pay for him whether he attended regularly or not: so long as he attended at all you would have to pay for him?—Yes.

223. Do you not think a similar plan should operate in the public schools?—I have not given much attention to the matter.

224. You approve of a colonial scale?—Yes.

225. You approve of the principle of staffing suggested here in this proposed colonial scale?—I should like less pupil-teachers.

226. You think a system could be adopted under which there should be no pupil-teachers?—Yes.

227. *Mr. Smith.*] You said it would be better to do without pupil-teachers?—Yes.

228. Could you suggest any plan for dispensing with pupil-teachers?—More money.

229. You do not think it possible under the limits of this Commission's order of reference?—I am afraid not.

230. Is not a teacher required to prepare the whole of the children on the school-roll for examination?—Yes.

231. He has to teach the roll-number, not the average attendance?—That is so.

232. Although the average attendance may be, say, 75, he has to teach the roll-number—say, 100?—Yes.

233. You think it is a fair way of paying teachers, to pay them on the average attendance?—As I have said, I have not considered the question very seriously; but I do not see any reason to alter the opinion I expressed just now, because there would be much more temptation if the salaries were based on the maximum number.

234. Do you think it would be an improvement to raise the percentage of the working-average from 50 to 75?—I think it might be left at 50.

235. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] With reference to your Committee's allowance, does the Committee find the allowance sufficient at your school, or does it worry you to get up entertainments?—The allowance is not sufficient; we are always being bothered to get up entertainments.

236. Are the school-grounds kept fairly well?—Yes, fairly.

237. Is the school kept clean?—Yes, fairly clean. We should like to see the buildings painted and repaired oftener.

238. There are a good many small schools in your district: do you think the Board has gone too far in establishing small schools?—My opinion is that it has. Some small schools should be done without. But I am not conversant with the country districts.

239. You know that up to 15 in average attendance a school is called an aided school, and costs the Board very little?—Yes; I think the principle of carrying children to a neighbouring school might have been worked upon, perhaps, instead of building small schools.

240. Probably you do not know the roads in the back blocks?—I know there is that difficulty in some cases, but I also know of cases where the plan of carrying the children might have been very easily adopted.

241. My opinion is that it would cost more to carry children to a neighbouring school than to open a small one?—Very likely in many cases; but where there is, perhaps, a high road or a railway I think it could be done, instead of starting a small school.

242. *Mr. Hogben.*] The scale of pay for head-teachers in the Wellington District is not based strictly on average attendance, is it? It is based on two elements, is it not—the teacher's certificate and the average attendance?—Yes.

243. The larger element is the certificate?—Only in the smaller salaries.

244. I am speaking of schools under 300 more especially. The salaries payable on the classification run from £135 up to £175 for a male teacher; the salaries payable for average attendance run from £20 up to £130; so that in every case the salary payable on a certificate is greater than the amount payable on the average attendance?—I have not compared them that way.

245. What I want to get at is this: whether a system that depends so largely on the certificate—something like 60 to 80 per cent.—rather than on the attendance is capable of being kept working within a capitation grant at all. A system that does not depend for the most part on average attendance is bound to fail at some time or other if the payments are made out of the capitation grant, which does depend on average attendance?—Yes, that is so.

246. Then, the failure, sooner or later, of such a scale as the Wellington one is almost inevitable?—Yes.

247. It would be more and more expensive as the certificates rose?—Yes.

248. The Wellington Board have perceived that to some extent, apparently, for by a later regulation they have inserted a maximum salary?—Yes; but I do not know whether they did it with that view. They inserted that maximum salary in the days when they did not see any danger.

249. But it is a safeguard to a certain extent?—Yes.

250. It is obviously intended as a safeguard, and must work to some extent as a safeguard?—As I say, I do not think it came into existence as a safeguard.

251. With regard to salaries, you say that the male head-teachers would suffer generally under the proposed scale?—I have not made a comparison.

252. Take one example: what is the salary payable under the Board's scale for a school of, say, 27—I mean according to the scale, not what they are paying now?—That is what I have been doing—taking the salaries not according to the scale, but those actually paid.

253. Do you think it advisable that separate provision should be made for house allowance—separate from salaries?—Yes.

254. Do you think it would be a wise thing to pay it out of the building vote, as suggested in the proposed scale?—I can hardly say.

255. At all events, you think separate provision should be made for house allowance?—Yes.

256. Separate from a scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

257. Otherwise in some places you could not equalise salaries in schools of the same size where in the one case there was a house and in the other there was not?—Yes.

258. Are the Inspectors at Home under the central department or under the School Boards?—Both.

259. I am speaking of the Inspectors that make the general reports?—They are His Majesty's Inspectors, under the central department.

260. But most large School Boards have their own Inspectors?—Yes, a very small number.

261. The reports that are published every year in the annual report of the Board of Education at Home, in England and Scotland, are based upon the reports of His Majesty's Inspectors?—Yes, but there is generally a report from the local Inspectors too. The report on the school by His Majesty's Inspector determines the grant.

262. Are you aware that in some cases School Boards have had the advice of His Majesty's Inspectors?—I cannot say that I am actually aware of it, but I should think it would be the case.

263. You spoke in favour of capitation by grade—the salaries being ranked according to grade, and increases according to grades and divisions, and not by unitary capitation: supposing that the attendance fell from 41 to 40, the master would lose in the one case £10, and in the other £1?—Yes.

264. And the same at every step?—Those limits, of course, are just the difficulty. On the whole, perhaps, it would be easier to go by grades than by unitary limits.

265. But do you not think it would operate very harshly sometimes when a teacher lost £10 a year through losing one pupil?—Yes, that would be so.

266. If you made steps of ten, one teacher in ten would suffer severely, and the average teacher would not gain at all?—It might be advisable, up to a certain size of school, to go by units, and then by grades.

267. When the increases become small go by grades?—Yes.

268. *The Chairman.*] According to the report of your Committee, which you read, the question of adequate staffing is considered of the first importance?—Yes.

269. Has the Committee carefully compared the staffing provided in the original scheme with the staffing proposed in this amended scale?—We have only had the amended scale for certain limits.

270. You state, in the report of the Committee, that the original scheme of staffing is numerically adequate; the new scheme considerably reduces the staffing: do you think the staffing suggested in the alternative scheme is sufficient?—It depends on the point of view from which you look at it. The staff set down in the alternative scheme is as good a staff as we have now.

271. Do you think the present staff requires strengthening?—I think so.

272. In the alternative scale, compared with the other one, the staffing is reduced in order to increase the salaries: do you think that an advantage? I am speaking with regard to the teachers' point of view, but ask you whether it would be an advantage to the schools?—If you let the salary fall you get a poorer class of teacher.

273. But do you think it is wise to reduce the staffing in order to increase the salaries?—I think, on the whole, we prefer the alternative scheme to the former. The second scale, on the whole, would be more to the advantage of the schools.

274. Then, you think that the salaries rather than the staffs require improving?—No; speaking for our own schools, in neither case would the salaries be increased.

275. We have two schemes before us, and I want to know which of the two you approve of—the one that raises the salaries or the one that increases the staffs?—I think, taking the good of the school as a whole into consideration, the second scale would be the better. Under the first the pay of the men would be considerably lower, and we should get inferior men.

276. You think the new scale is the better one of the two?—Yes; but I do not set either of them down as models. We have not seen this second scale worked out, and are talking in the dark with regard to it. It is, however, a better scale of staff than we have at present.

277. Your Committee say in their report that the minimum salary paid to males should be £110, and to females £100: is there any difference in the work that they have to do?—The reason I gave was that we thought that if men are to be secured for the service they must receive a little extra. Women leave much more frequently than men.

278. Do you know of any other profession in life where that is taken into consideration—*i.e.*, the fact that a man or woman may be liable to leave?—I think, in every trade a woman is paid less than a man.

279. But do you know that that reason influences employers?—I think so. You would not expect a man to carefully train a servant, during which time he is not much good to him, if he expects him to leave immediately after being trained.

280. But there is nothing binding, is there, upon a servant to remain in a service in learning a trade?—Nothing that I know of.

281. Do you know whether any difference is made in the public service between the pay of men and women when equal work is rendered?—I have not the figures before me.

282. Do you think that if males are paid more than females it will constitute a serious grievance, and be a source of very great irritation between young men and women in the service of the Education Board?—There is a considerable difference at present.

283. But do you not think that the whole source of complaint should be removed instead of being partially remedied?—I do not see very well how you can, under existing circumstances.

284. What is there to prevent it?—I do not mind personally, if you start on what is recognised as a fair basis for the men, and make it open competition right through.

285. Take the case of two first-class teachers—one a man and the other a woman: why should the man be paid 25 per cent. more than the woman for doing the same work?—The whole social organization is based on this: a man is supposed to keep a household, and a woman is not.

286. Take two teachers that are both single, and on equal terms: why should a man receive more than a woman?—You are taking an exceptional case; ninety male teachers out of a hundred are married.

287. But the women teachers may have sisters, mothers, &c., dependent on them?—Yes, but on the whole they are exceptions.

288. Do you think there ought to be one salary for the unmarried men and women, and another salary for those who are married?—No.

289. That is what it really comes to: would you give a married man more salary than an unmarried man?—In nearly every case the man is married.

290. Do you not think that by giving equal pay for equal work you get better work?—I have no objection to equal pay for equal work as long as it is paid on the basis on which you pay the men now. In my opinion, the tendency would be, if both were paid alike, to screw down the salaries and get the men out of the service.

291. Then, you think the men are not equal to competing with the women on fair terms in the teaching profession?—Not on the same salaries. It is the question of child-labour again, in another phase. When you allow children in trades the wages are reduced.

292. When vacancies representing salaries of £150 and upwards occur, what kind of applicants generally fill those vacancies—men or women?—Generally men.

293. But when it comes down to a matter of £120?—Mostly women.

294. Is there any lack of efficient teachers in this district for the vacancies that occur?—So far as my knowledge goes, there is a difficulty in getting junior male assistants.

295. I mean well-paid positions, where the salary is £150 and upwards: do a lot of outside applications then come in?—Perhaps so.

296. You expressed the opinion that the Inspectors should be under the central department?—Yes.

297. If they were under the central department, do you think it would be most satisfactory as far as the schools are concerned—would the inspection be better?—Personally, I should be very sorry to lose our Inspector.

298. Do you think that a new Inspector coming into a district would be likely to do as much justice to the schools and the teachers as a man who has been acquainted with them for years?—There would be a greater interchange of views.

299. You think it would be an advantage, then?—I think it would be an advantage.

300. I want to know what the object would be in placing Inspectors under a central authority and removing them from the control of the Boards: would they work harder or better under a central authority in Wellington than under the Boards?—There would be more interchange of opinion, more light brought from one district to another.

301. Do you think that the present system is defective—that we are not making good progress?—I would not say so; but we are not making the progress we might.

302. Is that the fault of the Inspectors?—No; it is hard to say exactly whose fault it is.

303. Do you think that the Board is less considerate to the teachers with regard to salary and other things than a central authority would be likely to be?—They should be under a central authority.

304. Do you think a central department would be more generous in voting you money for salaries than the Boards?—Yes.

305. Assuming that, in order to bring about a uniform scale of salaries for similar work all over New Zealand, it was necessary to reduce salaries in one district and increase them in another, do you think that would give general satisfaction?—Nobody likes to be reduced; but we recognise that, perhaps, that would be inevitable.

306. Do you not think the teachers would be likely to complain?—Of course, those who would be reduced would complain.

307. You think it would be well to make a sacrifice in one place if it were necessary to bring them all up to an equal level?—It might be necessary.

308. With regard to house allowances, I suppose you have some knowledge of the amount of house allowance made in different places: is it a fact that in one case in this district £50 is allowed for house allowance, and in another case only £10?—Yes.

309. Do you not think £10 a year rather a small house allowance?—Yes.

310. Would you be in favour of granting assistants house allowance as well as headmasters? You have assistants here in Wellington who are married men; they have to pay tolerably heavy rents: would you be in favour of paying them house allowance?—It is really all a question of salary.

311. If house allowance is paid to headmasters, should it not be paid to assistants?—In adjusting the assistants' salaries no house allowance has been paid. No assistants throughout the colony have house allowance. The position of the head-teachers is different; the majority of them have a house.

312. If the headmasters claim house allowance, why should not the assistants?—We claim that there should be a uniform salary throughout.

313. And that house allowance should be included in salary: is that it?—The salary should be fixed, so that if you have a house or not you are on the same basis.

314. Your Committee propose to rate men and women assistants separately—*i.e.*, first, second, third, &c., male assistants; and first, second, third, &c., female assistants: why is that?—It would make it easier to adjust the pay on some such scheme as this.

315. But if you are going to have satisfactory discipline in a school, do you not think that the headmaster should have control and be able to arrange his assistants irrespective of whether they are men or women?—Yes.

316. As headmaster, you would not like to be told who was to be placed in charge of the Sixth and Seventh Standards?—Certainly not.

317. If you had a good, strong, capable woman teacher, who was more competent than the male assistants, you would place her in charge of one of those standards?—Yes.

A. Erskine, representing Assistants, Wellington, examined.

318. *The Chairman.*] You are first assistant at the Terrace School?—Yes. As a representative of the assistants in this district, I wish to deal with the matter entirely from a male assistant's point of view. The feeling in this district amongst male assistants is that sufficient inducements are not offered by the new scale to attract men into the profession, and to keep those assistants in the profession who are at present in it.

319. Are you referring to the later scale?—No; the previous one, for the reason that I know nothing about the other one. There is nothing in the alternative scale that we can deal with at all; we know nothing of what is to be given to assistant masters under it.

Mr. Hogben: I will explain. The saving of staff in schools of under 330 effected by the alternative scale would set free sufficient money to provide for all assistants, male and female (with three or four exceptions, I think, in the colony), being paid at a rate as high as any existing scale in New Zealand.

The Chairman: Under the proposed new scale the assistants would be raised to the highest level obtaining in any district in the colony.

Mr. Hogben: Take a school with an average attendance of between 420 and 480: the first assistant would have a salary of £220, the second £170, and the third £110. The salaries run up from those figures to £250, £200, and £130.

Mr. Erskine: Of course, we have considered this matter from the point of view of the first suggested scale, not the alternative scale. I think, if that is the proposal, that assistant masters in this district will be more satisfied. One objection to the first scale was the alternation of male and female assistants, and if that is done away with one of our objections will be removed. Well, then, I propose first of all to deal with the question whether the profession would be rendered more attractive. Under the first scale it would not have been so, and especially, I think, with regard to the very first step in the case of the pupil-teacher. He would receive a salary for the first year of £20, rising by £10 a year to £50. I think that would not render the profession attractive, especially to males. In other departments of the Government service cadets, who are not supposed to be either physically, morally, or mentally more capable than those that we wish to get into the profession, have very much better prospects. The Post Office cadet, for instance, starts with £40, and in his fourth year ends with £85, getting a rise of £10 the second year, £15 the third year, and £20 in his fourth year. Then, in the case of the Government Railways, the first year the cadet gets £30, the second year £40, the third £50, and the fourth £60. I think those salaries will attract youths into those professions to the detriment of the teaching profession. Then, again, if the pupil-teacher is forced to work away from home, his lodging-allowance amounts only to £10 a year, decreasing in his third and fourth years to £5 a year. In the Railway Department the cadet gets as lodging-allowance £26 in the first year, £20 the second year, £13 the third, and £9 the fourth. The Post Office cadet gets even better; he receives £26 lodging-allowance for the first year, the same for the second year, and £13 the third year; in his fourth year he does not get any, but

he is getting a salary of £85 a year, and is not any older than the pupil-teacher, who will be receiving £50 a year. Besides that, the pupil-teacher has to pass examinations every year; the cadet does not; he has all his time to himself; he may, if he chooses, pass a shorthand examination, by which he will get three months added to his time of service, and that means something to him. Then, there was a regulation under the proposed scale which we thought would have the effect of preventing males from entering the service: at the end of four years the pupil-teacher would lose a part of his salary—he would have to go back to £40 a year. We thought that a great objection, and without a parallel as far as we knew.

Mr. Hogben: I may point out that in some copies of the proposed scale two words were omitted by the printer. It should read "if uncertificated." If a fifth-year pupil-teacher has his certificate he is not subject to reduction, nor if he moves to another school. That is how the scale should read.

Mr. Erskine: That alters the case to a great extent. I intended to go on in that line with regard to assistant masters right through. Of course, under the alternative scale the assistant master will get a better salary. The local Institute came to the conclusion that the minimum salary for male assistants should be £110 a year; they thought that was as small a salary as a male assistant could possibly live on, especially in this district. Then, with respect to the positions open to the male assistants, under the alternative scale I notice that an assistant, besides an infant mistress, would be appointed in schools of 150 average attendance. The male assistants hoped that that appointment would be a fairly good one, that it would not be an appointment carrying the minimum salary, for the male assistant in a school with an average attendance of 150 generally has important work to do. He has very often two classes, and he should be a man, I think, of some experience, some attainment, and should be of great help to the headmaster. If the first male assistant to appear on the staff should appear in a school of an average attendance of not less than 150, that would leave only sixteen schools in this district where males would be employed. We think that the first male assistant should be an experienced man, a man of a good many years' experience, of some literary attainment as well; and that a man with a D3 certificate would not be good enough for the position as proposed in the scale. A man with a D3 certificate has an experience, perhaps, of only seven or eight years, and would not be competent to fill the position. Men of very much greater experience, such as those that are holding the positions at present, should be appointed; many of them throughout the colony have had from fifteen to twenty-five years' experience, and I think they should get good salaries. The majority of them are married men, and have families to support. We think that in this district especially the male assistants should receive larger salaries, for the reason that the cost of living is much higher here than in other districts. I know of cases in Wellington of men supporting families on £150 a year, and paying one-third of that salary for rent. With regard to the proposed staffing of the schools as first, second, third, &c., male assistants, and first, second, third, &c., female assistants, the assistant masters are entirely in agreement with the proposal of the Institute.

320. *Mr. Davidson.*] What experience have you had?—Twenty years.

321. In what positions?—Entirely as assistant master, in schools ranging from 200 to 550.

322. You have never had any experience as a headmaster at any class of school?—No.

323. Did you serve an apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

324. In your opinion, the right class of boy is not entering the teaching profession at the present time?—I think not. In this district very few have entered the profession at all; I have been engaged in the instruction of pupil-teachers for some years, and I do not think the appointments of male pupil-teachers have averaged two a year.

325. Do you not think that the low salaries to begin with, and the want of prospect in the future for pupil-teachers, have had a good deal to do with boys not entering the service?—I think so.

326. Then, if some satisfactory scale were introduced whereby the position of the teacher throughout the colony would be improved, that perhaps would have the effect of bringing into the profession a desirable class of boys?—It would probably do so.

327. You have noticed the alternative scale, and have heard what the Inspector-General had to say respecting it as far as assistants were concerned?—Yes; it is the first time I have heard that.

328. What is the average attendance at your school at the present time?—About 500. Last quarter of last year it was 523.

329. It will come in between 510 and 570: what is your salary at the present time?—£220.

330. Under the Otago scale in that class of school the salary of the first assistant is £240, so that if the salary of first assistant at the grade of school in which you are now employed were raised to the rate paid in Otago your position would be greatly improved?—Yes.

331. If such a scheme were adopted you would find your position and salary much improved?—Yes, according to that.

332. Do you think that if such a scheme were adopted throughout the colony the male assistants would be fairly well satisfied?—They would certainly be more satisfied than if the first scheme had been adopted.

333. Would they not be more satisfied than at present, when thirteen different scales of salary obtain throughout the colony?—I think so.

334. Have you compared the salaries of male assistants in the different districts of the colony?—Not carefully.

335. I suppose you know that the salaries paid to male assistants in Otago and North Canterbury are, on the whole, very much better than the average for the colony?—Yes; higher than in Wellington, for instance.

336. You object to the alternating of the sexes, as suggested in the first scale?—Yes.

337. If it were provided that the first assistant in schools above a certain average attendance should be a male, and that the following assistants might be either male or female, according as

the Education Board, probably under the advice of their Inspector, and after consultation with the headmaster, might decide, do you not think that would get over the objection some male assistants have to the scale?—I think I should support the proposal of our Institute, that assistants should be ranked first, second, and third male assistants, and first, second, and third females—that is, supposing there were three of each—the salaries of the assistant mistresses bearing a fair proportion to those of the men in like positions.

338. Have you any opinion to express on this point: whether the average female assistant is physically capable of managing a Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth Standard of 60 or more pupils in a large mixed school?—I think that she would find the strain very great in a year or two.

339. There are exceptional women who can do, have done, and are doing the work?—Certainly.

340. You objected to the alternating of the sexes as far as assistants were concerned: if it were provided that the second or following assistants might be of either sex, so as to make it possible for an exceptional woman to take the second position, would that not get over the difficulty you referred to?—That would be providing for an exception, and the scale, I think, should not include provision for such cases.

341. You would prefer, then, to have the male and female assistants classed as suggested by the Institute?—Yes. Of course, the second male in all large schools has to take charge of a very large upper standard.

342. Do you know at what attendance, under the Otago scale, the first male assistant comes in?—No.

343. At from 231 to 270: under this alternative scale the first place where there are two assistants on the staff is 150 to 200?—Yes.

344. That is the first grade; now there is an infant mistress in charge of the infants, and probably Standard I.?—Yes.

345. Standards II. and III. might well be taught by a female assistant: do you not think so? I have had no experience of those schools.

346. Your experience as a teacher, apart from your experience in that particular type of school, would lead you to say that the Second and Third Standards in a country school might well be in charge of a certificated woman?—That might be so. I had hoped that the next assistant would have been a man in those schools, because it leaves so very few schools in the colony in which first assistant masters will be employed at all. There are only 153 schools, I think, in the whole colony with an average attendance of 150 and over, and it is only in those schools that assistant masters will be employed, and where you will be training your future headmasters.

347. Would it not be better for the men to take sole charge of country schools rather than of classes in the instruction of which a woman might better be employed?—I think there will not be enough men to go into the country unless there are a fairly large number of assistant masters.

348. Do you think that, as a rule, the country schools are supplied from the assistant masters?—To a certain extent.

349. Are they not supplied by male pupil-teachers who have gone through their course and served probably one or two years at a training-college?—Not in this district.

350. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do the assistants of Wellington approve of a colonial scale in principle?—We do.

351. They are thoroughly in accord with it?—Yes.

352. *Mr. Luke.*] What is your certificate?—D1.

353. You think that if the provision in the alternative scale to give assistants the maximum salaries paid in any part of the colony were adopted by the Commissoners it would be satisfactory and acceptable to assistants throughout the colony?—I think so.

354. What certificate do you think a head-teacher should have in a school of, say, 350 or 400?—A very large number of the headmasters of the colony, holding the best positions, have a D1 certificate, and I think that would be a very good basis to go on.

355. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you represent the Teachers' Institute?—Yes.

356. Are you one of the chosen representatives?—I am.

357. Was a meeting held to select representatives?—A meeting was held to consider the matter, a Committee was appointed to draw up a report—that which was read by Mr. Watson—and that Committee selected its representatives.

358. Was their action indorsed by the Institute?—It was.

359. You said that under the suggested scale—I suppose that you were referring to No. 1—there were not attractions enough for men to join the service: is it not a fact that when a vacancy occurs for an assistant in a town school there are a very large number of applicants?—Under the present circumstances, perhaps; but the lowest salary paid in this district to the male assistant is £100, whereas under the proposed scale the lowest would have been £80.

360. With regard to pupil-teachers, do you not consider there are too many employed at the Terrace School?—Yes.

361. How many just now?—Six, I think.

362. How would the suggested scale affect the Terrace School in the matter of staffing?—Under the first scale there would have been one assistant more than at present.

363. The amended scale would reduce the number of pupil-teachers provided in the first scale by one?—Yes, I understand so.

364. Would that benefit the school: would that increase the efficiency as far as the teaching is concerned?—The assistants would be the same in number as at present, I believe. If we got another assistant the school would be benefited.

365. With regard to the salaries of pupil-teachers, you say that the suggested scale would not allow of sufficient salaries for the pupil-teachers: do you consider that the regulations of the

Wellington Board allow them sufficient salaries?—I think not. The average, I believe, is about the same as that proposed in the new scale.

366. With the exception of the fifth year, of course?—Yes.

367. Do you consider that male and female pupil-teachers should receive equal pay?—I see no reason why they should not.

368. Do you consider that we should have equal pay for equal work—that, as well as teachers in the various districts getting the same rate of pay, female teachers should get the same rate of remuneration as males for similar work?—I think not.

369. Why?—For the reasons given by Mr. Watson this morning.

370. You have no reasons other than those put forward by Mr. Watson?—I think they cover all that I could say on the matter.

371. What do you consider a fair ratio of difference between the salaries paid to male and female teachers—the same sliding-scale as that suggested by Mr. Watson?—It was proposed that a first assistant woman should receive about 75 per cent. of the salary paid to a first assistant man, and that the proportion should increase as you go down the scale.

372. With regard to small country schools, what difference would you make in the salaries paid to male and female teachers respectively?—I have not considered that matter.

373. Would you consider 10 per cent. a sufficient differentiation?—I would rather not answer that question, as I have not considered the matter.

374. If the salaries of teachers were brought up to the level of the salaries paid in Otago they would have more reason to be satisfied than under present circumstances?—Certainly.

375. I suppose that, like Oliver Twist, they would never be quite content?—That is human nature.

376. With regard to certificates, in some districts the Inspectors lay down a rule that an assistant teacher shall not go up to Grade 1, but must remain at Grade 2 until he has had experience as a master of a school: is that plan adopted in the Wellington District?—I think not; I am an example.

377. With regard to the appointment of teachers, is any provision made by the Wellington Board for the transfer or promotion of teachers within the district?—They promote their own teachers.

378. Supposing that you left the school that you are in, and a vacancy were thereby created, would they promote the second assistant to the position?—Not necessarily.

379. They would call for applications?—Yes.

380. I suppose they would consider the claims of the second assistant for promotion?—If he applied I suppose his case would be considered. We have had cases of second assistants being appointed to first-assistantships; it does not always occur that the second assistant at the same school is promoted to the vacancy.

381. Do you find that there is a tendency on the part of country teachers to gravitate towards the towns, or the larger centres?—I think so.

382. For what reason?—I am not a country teacher. I have heard a married man say that he wished to come into town in order that his children might attend college; there are many other similar reasons.

383. With regard to the minimum certificates required for assistants according to the suggested scale, do you agree with them? For example, a first assistant requires D3 for a school of from 75 to 100: do you consider that too high?—I think that in schools of over 300 D3 is too low.

384. But up to 300?—I have no objection to that at all. For a school of over 300 I think the certificate ought to be much higher—at any rate, D2.

385. Do you agree with D2?—Yes.

386. The assistant teachers think that under the suggested scale there would not be the increase of salaries that they consider they are entitled to, or proportionate to what would be given to other classes of teachers?—That was their grievance with regard to the first scale, but I think the male assistants in this district will be fairly well satisfied with the salaries under the alternative scale.

387. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you believe in the continuance of the pupil-teacher system as a part of the staffing of the public schools?—I think it is necessary to have some pupil-teachers, but I do not think there should be so many as are employed at present in the various districts.

388. Suppose it were possible to arrange to do without pupil-teachers, do you think it would be advisable in the interests of education?—Most decidedly.

389. Are you of opinion that in large schools the assistants, equally with the headmaster, should be required to assist in the instruction of pupil-teachers?—That is a matter I have not considered, but I do not think they should be.

390. Do you not assist in the preparation of pupil-teachers?—We have a slightly different system from other districts. All the city pupil-teachers are massed in classes, and five instructors are appointed, who take a subject each. They each give a lesson once a week.

391. Do they get special payment for that?—Yes.

392. Suppose that in the arrangement of salaries it is found necessary to require all certificated assistants to assist the headmaster in the preparation of pupil-teachers, do you consider it would be a fair thing to include payment for this special aspect of school-work in their salaries? In other words, do you think the instruction-money should be merged in the salaries paid, and that there should be no special payment?—I think there should be some allowance made for the tuition of pupil-teachers.

393. Suppose this allowance were merged in the salaries, and the scale so altered as to include such payment, do you think it would not be better than the system that obtains here?—I am hardly able to judge.

394. Do you not think that it would be better to make the certificated staff of a school responsible for the training of pupil-teachers not merely in instruction, but in the art of school-management?—Perhaps it would be advisable, but I think the system that obtains here has been fairly successful.

395. I am not assuming that the system here has not been effective; I am asking for your opinion as to the advisability of requiring the assistants to take part equally with the headmaster in the preparation of pupil-teachers?—Perhaps it would be advisable.

396. You believe in a general scheme for the payment of salaries?—I believe in a colonial scale.

397. I suppose you are aware that this proposed scale is based upon a capitation allowance of £4?—I understand so.

398. And that your salaries are to be based upon a capitation of £3 8s. 9d.?—Yes.

399. Do you think that it would be possible for your Board, assuming that it had an extra capitation allowance of 5s. to be spent wholly upon the teachers' salaries, to pay as good salaries as those laid down in the proposed scale?—I have not gone into calculations of that kind.

400. Assuming that the Board could do so, would you still be in favour of a colonial scale?—I think so.

401. Do you approve of this suggested staffing of the schools? Have you analysed the staffing at all?—I have not analysed the alternative scale at all.

402. I was going to ask you what you thought of the proposed staff of a school of, say, between 120 and 150?—That brings me back to the proposal that the extra assistant there should be a man.

403. It states here that in a school of between 120 and 150 there would be a principal teacher, an assistant—called here an infant mistress—and two pupil-teachers: do you think that that is efficient staffing for a school like that?—As far as I am able to judge, I should say it would be.

404. I understood you to say that an assistant master was required in such a school?—I misunderstood you; it is from 150 to 200 where the assistant comes in.

405. This amended scale says that there should be a principal teacher, an infant mistress, and one assistant; of course, it would follow that that assistant would be an assistant master: have you noticed what salary it is proposed to give that assistant master?—No.

406. I am going back to the first scale: in a school of from 150 to 175 the salary payable to the assistant master would be £90?—Yes.

407. Do you think that is an adequate salary?—No, I think not.

408. Suppose, however, the male assistant in a school of this kind was what we might call a junior assistant—*i.e.*, an assistant who had been certificated less than, say, three years, and was not entitled to be called a qualified assistant as we understand it: do you think that under such circumstances £90 would be sufficient?—Not for a certificated assistant.

409. Say he has been a pupil-teacher for four years; he has ended his pupil-teachership with a salary of £50 or £60, and he begins as a junior assistant in a school of this kind: do you think that £90 would be sufficient for a young fellow of that description?—I do not think so.

410. What do you think a young man—certificated—who has been teaching, and is twenty or twenty-one years of age, ought to receive?—I think the minimum should be about £110. A young man such as that would probably have to live away from home, and have to pay for board and lodging. He would have to go on with his studies, and consequently would have to pay for "coaching," and have a number of expenses in regard to books. I do not think he could live on less than £110 a year.

411. You think some encouragement should be given to a young fellow of such a type as this to go on with his studies?—Yes.

412. And you think that £110 would be a proper amount to give, instead of £90?—It would be better.

413. Are you in favour of the proposed scheme so far as the certificate classification of teachers is concerned? Do you think that the present system of classifying teachers is a good one?—There should be one certificate for teachers.

414. One certificate should be issued by the department, and that certificate should qualify the holder to compete for anything as a teacher—like a captain's certificate qualifies for a ship?—Yes; of course, when he came into competition with others his other qualifications would have to help him along.

415. Your opinion is that even a graduate should be required to get that certificate before he could teach, like an ordinary individual?—I think so.

416. He should go through the requirements, just the same as an ordinary teacher would be required to go through a graduate's course, if he desired to obtain a graduate's degree?—I think so.

417. *Mr. Hogben.*] Can you tell me of any scale in the colony that gives £100 to an assistant master at a school of 151?—I believe an assistant at Featherston gets more than that.

418. I am speaking of the scale, not what is paid?—Then, I could not say.

419. With regard to the larger schools, at the Terrace School, with an average attendance of under 500, the salary of the first assistant is £220?—Yes.

420. If the salary were placed at £230 you would get a rise of £10 a year?—Yes.

421. What salary does the second assistant master get?—£150.

422. Therefore a salary of £175 would be a rise of £25?—Yes.

423. A salary of £112 for the third assistant master would be an increase of £12?—Yes.

424. Take Clyde Quay: do you know the average there?—About 700.

425. The first assistant master gets £220: if his salary were placed at £250 he would get a rise of £30?—Yes.

426. The second assistant master gets £150: if his salary were raised to £180 it would be an increase of £30?—Yes.

427. The third assistant master gets £100: if his salary were increased to £125 it would be an increase of £25?—Yes.

428. *The Chairman.*] You think that the pupil-teachers would not be paid enough under this scale?—That is my opinion.

429. What improvement would you make: what would be a fair amount for a pupil-teacher to begin with?—I compared pupil-teachers with the Post Office and Railway cadets, and I think something between the rates paid to them would be a fair salary for a pupil-teacher.

430. Do you think there is much difference between male and female teachers in the matter of qualifications?—It depends on the work. I think that up to a certain standard, where a lady teacher can stand the strain, her work is just as good as a man's.

431. Would you be in favour of introducing any new system under which strong, or what may be termed "exceptional," lady teachers, who have qualified for the work, would be absolutely prohibited from teaching the higher standards?—I think a headmaster should have liberty to organize his staff as he thinks fit.

J. C. Webb, First Assistant Master, Thorndon School, representing the Male Assistants, examined.

Mr. Webb: I do not wish to make a statement, but only to answer questions. Mr. Erskine has said, practically, all there was to be said, leaving nothing for me to add.

432. *The Chairman.*] You have heard Mr. Erskine: do you agree with what he has said?—Yes.

433. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—I have been nine years in the Board's service as a public-school teacher.

434. Did you serve an apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher?—No.

435. Have you taught as headmaster at any school?—Yes; at a country school.

436. What was the average attendance there?—From 40 to 50.

437. Then, you can express an opinion on some questions that I omitted to ask Mr. Erskine. Do you notice that, under the alternative scale, when the attendance at a school reaches 40 the first assistance is granted, and it takes the form of a certificated assistant mistress?—Yes.

438. Do you approve of that staffing?—I think it is sufficient.

439. Would you prefer the assistance of a certificated teacher to a pupil-teacher at that stage?—I do not think it would be necessary.

440. What staff would you suggest after the average attendance reaches 40?—You have the head-teacher and an assistant mistress.

441. It has been suggested in some districts that, instead of an infant mistress, the assistance should take the form of a pupil-teacher: what is your opinion?—I think a pupil-teacher would be sufficient in a school of that size.

442. A pupil-teacher who was just beginning work as a teacher, or a pupil-teacher who had had two or three years' experience?—The latter.

443. Where would you bring in the assistant mistress or infant mistress?—At the next rise—65 to 90.

444. Do you not think that a school with an average attendance of 64—*i.e.*, a school having about 85 on the roll, and sometimes that number present—too heavy for a man with the assistance only of a pupil-teacher?—I understand your question to be, would we introduce an assistant at 65?

445. You say not until 65 is reached?—From 40 to 65 simply a pupil-teacher; the assistant to be introduced at 65.

446. What I say is this: Take a school having an average attendance of 64, the roll-number being probably 85; that school should have a staff of a master and a pupil-teacher only?—64 would be rather heavy.

447. Would you suggest that the assistance you spoke of just now—*i.e.*, a second- or third-year pupil-teacher—should be allowed in schools of, say, from 40 to 50?—Yes.

448. Then, you would have in the schools between 50 and 90 a certificated mistress in addition to the headmaster?—Yes.

449. You think that is a fairly liberal staff?—Yes.

450. From your experience as a country teacher, would you approve of the suggestion to grant the same salary to either sex in schools of from 14 to 19?—Yes.

451. Then, in this alternative scale the salaries are differentiated after £100 is reached?—My answer to that would be identical with that of Mr. Erskine.

452. You think that it is wise to differentiate in the salaries?—Yes.

453. Do you think that it is in the interests of women themselves that the salaries should be differentiated?—I have not considered it from that view-point at all.

454. Do you think, if the salaries were equalised and were sufficiently liberal to induce young men, probably young married men, to apply for these positions, that School Committees would in the majority of cases take the married men in preference to single ladies?—Certainly.

455. Then, to equalise salaries would not be in the interests of the women?—No.

456. Do you not think that at the present time the disparity between the salaries paid to the different sexes is too great in some districts?—Yes.

457. Then, I understand you to mean this: that in the interests of women themselves you would bring the salaries of the sexes into closer proximity—that is, you would reduce the disparity, and throw positions open to either sex?—Yes.

458. But you would not equalise the salaries?—No.

459. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you consider your work as first assistant master more difficult than your work in the country school where you were formerly engaged?—Yes.

460. In what way do you consider it more difficult?—Owing to organization. Since I have been a first assistant I have had practically three classes to teach. I have taught the Sixth and Seventh, and done scholarship-work in conjunction with the two.

461. How many pupils do you teach?—From 50 to 74; I mean, of course, in Standards VI. and VII., and the scholarship-work.

462. How many children did you have in the country?—From Standards III. to VII., not more than 28 altogether.

463. How many children were there below Standard III.?—25.

464. What help had you at that school?—One pupil-teacher.

465. You consider that your position as first assistant is far more difficult than your former position of head of the school?—Far more difficult.

466. That is, as a class-teacher?—Yes.

467. What salary did you get in the country?—£175.

468. And a house?—Yes.

469. That would be equal to about £200 a year?—About that.

470. You get £220 now?—Yes.

471. The extra £20 represents the increased work you are called upon to do?—Yes, I suppose so.

472. Do you think the £20 fairly represents it?—No.

473. What do you consider ought to be given to the first assistant in a school such as yours?—I consider that if I were paid according to the highest scale in the colony I would be paid none too highly. I understand that my salary under the alternative scale would be £240. I think that is none too ample.

474. Would that fairly represent the value of your services as first assistant?—Fairly. I might elaborate what Mr. Erskine has said in one particular: the first assistant is almost of necessity a married man.

475. What is the average attendance at the school at which you are working?—About 500. Since the fire of twelve months ago the average has fallen considerably.

476. Supposing the schools in this colony were arranged in ten classes, according to their average attendance, and it was decided that the salary paid to the first assistant in a school with the highest attendance should be equal to the salary paid to the headmaster of a school with, an attendance of say, 200, do you think such a plan would be acceptable to teachers?—There is an element entering into the question which I think should not be overlooked, and that is knowledge of organization. A first assistant, while supposed to possess that knowledge, is not frequently called upon to put it into use.

477. That is what I wanted. Do you tell me that the first assistant in a large school, say, of 600 is more capable as an organizer than the headmaster in a school of 200?—I do not think he is more capable, but as capable.

478. Then, if you think he is as capable, do you think that the plan of arranging that the salary of the first assistant in a large school shall be similar to that of the headmaster in a school with an average attendance of 200 would be acceptable and beneficial?—It depends on where you fix the numbers.

479. I am assuming that there is a classification of that sort, so that assistants in large schools should be equal to principals in smaller schools?—I see no strong objection to that. It is a matter that I have not thought out carefully.

480. The teachers have not considered such a plan as that?—As far as I am aware, they have not.

481. Are the teachers satisfied with the proposed classification in the first suggested scale?—I think the male assistants are not satisfied. They feel that D3 for an assistant in a large school is a low certificate. I may explain my own case. Since the fire at the Thorndon School twelve months ago I have been practically the headmaster of the girls' branch. Had I not had some knowledge of organization such an arrangement would have been impossible. A man with seven or eight years' experience cannot have a very wide experience of organization.

482. You think that the older a man grows the more capable he becomes as an organizer?—Certainly.

483. Do you not think there is a limit to that?—You mean that a man will at last learn the sum total?

484. Yes?—No; because education is progressive.

485. You think that really it is experience that constitutes the test of the man?—Mostly.

486. If he is experienced why do you want classification?—Simply because the longer he lives the more he knows.

487. Then, why not allow him to rise as high as he can without a certificate—I mean so long as he has Government recognition that he is a qualified teacher?—I agree with that.

488. Suppose a man and a woman were making boots, and each of them made twelve pairs of equal quality, would you expect the woman to receive lower payment than the man, just because she was a woman?—It would depend on the responsibilities of the woman outside of her employment. A man has more engagements to fulfil than a woman.

489. Do you tell me that the man ought to be paid more for twelve pairs of boots of similar quality than the woman?—Bootmaking is not teaching.

490. Let us have your answer about the boots?—I know nothing of the boot trade. I do not know the amount of skill required.

491. We will assume the boots were of equal quality: would you pay the woman at the same rate as the man?—If she were doing exactly the same work.

492. If you place a woman in a position in a school which a man has been occupying, and she does equally efficient work, would you pay her the same salary?—If she is doing the same work, yes.

493. *Mr. Hogben.*] You said that you would place pupil-teachers instead of infant mistresses in schools of from 40 to 50; there are over 140 such schools in the colony: what schools would you take the third- and fourth-year pupil-teachers that you referred to from?—I had not thought of that.

494. Would you take the 140 third- and fourth-year pupil-teachers from the larger schools?—I had not given full thought to that matter.

495. It would weaken the staffs of the big schools?—Yes.

496. You do not object to the principle of putting in a certificated mistress as the first assistance that a master gets?—No.

497. Therefore, if you saw such a danger as I have indicated you might modify the answer you gave before?—Yes.

498. As a point of staffing merely, it strengthens the staff to add a mistress rather than a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

499. *The Chairman.*] Do you consider that as first aid in a small school a pupil-teacher is sufficient?—Yes.

500. How many children do you think a master or mistress in a country school is able to teach without assistance?—I could have worked my own school with the assistance of only a monitor.

501. Up to what stage do you think you could have worked the school satisfactorily by yourself, without any assistance at all?—I had no experience of that.

502. You are not able to give information from your own knowledge of the district and the schools?—No.

503. According to this alternative scale, a mistress is added when the attendance at a school reaches 40: do you consider that when a school reaches that number another teacher in addition to the head of the school is necessary?—Not necessary.

504. Then, it follows that you think the expense of another teacher would be unnecessary?—Yes.

505. What difference in salary should there be between a female and a male assistant doing precisely the same work?—Starting at the highest salaries, the female teacher should get a salary of 75 per cent. of that paid to the male; as the salaries go down the difference should be less.

506. What kind of salaries would the 75 per cent. apply to?—I should say, start at £350 with a difference of 25 per cent., and reduce it as the salaries become lower

507. But there are no assistants' salaries ranging anything like £350: supposing a man gets £200, what do you think would be a fair salary for a female assistant in another school doing the same work?—About £160 a year.

Miss Lorimer, M.A., Headmistress Mount Cook Girls' School, representing the Wellington Education Institute, examined.

Miss Lorimer: Mistrusting my own oratorical powers, and having a good deal to say, I have made a written statement, in which I have endeavoured not so much to criticize the colonial scale as to controvert arguments prejudicial to women's interests brought forward by certain witnesses before the Commission. (I would like to say, parenthetically, that we women have discussed in detail the proposed scale, but I understand that the first scale is practically dead, and I know little or nothing about the alternative one.) As the best-paid woman in the service, I am here to-day to speak on behalf of the women teachers of this district, and particularly of the women assistants. A perusal of the evidence hitherto elicited by the Commissioners proves that the interests of women have been looked at from a man's point of view. No woman has had a seat on the Commission, and few have come forward to give evidence. This, however, does not indicate lack of interest on their part—an interest which is growing in intensity every day. It is due partly to the fact that for most women it is a distinct ordeal to speak in public, and partly also to the fact that from their hitherto subordinate position in schools they have become to some extent dependent upon men, and shrink from taking what appears to be an antagonistic position. A point of crucial importance has been the work which they are capable of doing, and from the opinions expressed by men teachers the unthinking would gather the impression that any learning we might be able to impart was only food for babes. Now, what are the facts? Take high schools first: Have those managed by women been any less successful than those managed by men, as far as the educational standard is concerned? As far as numbers are concerned, I grant they have not been so successful; but that is due not to incapacity on the part of the heads, but to social considerations. Formerly these schools were staffed—partially, at least—with men, but now women have fitted themselves for these positions, and have superseded the men. Then, in the primary schools women can do all the infant work better than men. Men themselves concede that. They can teach girls throughout the standards. Men do not deny that. They can teach boys up to and including Standard V. They do not desire to teach Standards VI. and VII. boys in large schools, because they cannot take the games or the drill, and because they think that to make the bigger boys manly they should be taught by men, just as to make the bigger girls womanly they should be taught by women. Now, as regards the men: They are not at home in an infants' school; many of them think it beneath their dignity to teach Standards II. and III.; they cannot teach sewing; they are not so suitable for Standards VI. and VII. girls, but are better for Standards VI. and VII. boys. Any impartial judge must allow that the greater part of the work of primary schools is work which may confidently be placed in the hands of women. It is, indeed, work for which women are by nature specially fitted. Here I should like to refer to some evidence given in Dunedin. A woman representative there stated that women did not desire to teach a class higher than Standard IV. in a mixed school. That woman is the seventh teacher on the staff of a school with an average of 451. There are three women teachers above her on the staff. Possibly she has had no opportunity of trying her wings, and Standard V. seems to be a height unattainable. Having

had myself no actual experience of mixed schools, and being anxious to obtain the opinion of the headmasters of this city upon the question, I wrote to four of them, asking if they considered that women were capable of successfully managing a mixed Standard V. class. One appeared not quite to understand my question, and gave a more or less satisfactory reply. Another said he would hesitate to place a woman in charge of such a class unless the numbers were below 45, and that he preferred in that standard to separate the sexes. Yet in that school a woman has been in charge of 79 boys and girls in Standard V., has had supervision of the sewing of the schools, and of the girls' playground, and has taken not only her own drill, but that of the girls taught by the men teachers, at a salary of £90. A third master replied as follows: "In reply to your note dated the 5th instant, asking for my opinion as to whether I consider women capable of successfully managing a mixed Standard V. class, I answer most certainly in the affirmative. For some reasons I would prefer them in a school of the size of this one (average between 500 and 600)—of course, always provided the women are capable teachers. With this proviso I consider they can more fully fill the office." The fourth replied: "Speaking from experience, I may say that the best teacher I have ever had, judging by results, in Standard V. was, and is, a woman. Nor have I reason to pick out one only to prove that women are capable of taking a Fifth Standard (boys). I have had several who have proved their capability." In this last school these women have, with the exception of the drill, been doing identically the same work as the men, obtaining better results, and getting £50 or £60 a year less. Turning now to the position of women employed by the Government in other departments: They have not been so employed long enough to be able to judge of the ultimate developments, but so far, I understand, cadets, whether men or women, have been placed on an equal footing, except in the Telephone and Public Trust Departments. The reasons why a difference has been made in these two cases are that it is not desirable to employ women on night duty in connection with the telephone, and, in connection with the Public Trust, women cannot be sent about the country to examine estates. In this latter department, I may remark, two women who left the teaching profession are now earning £150 a year each. Again, seven men are employed as Inspectors of Factories—four at £200, one at £145, one at £140, and one at £110. One woman is employed at a salary of £160. The General Post Office employs girls in the non-clerical branch, doing very simple work, such as examining telegrams to see if the correct charge has been made, &c. To obtain an appointment there a girl (or boy) has only to pass the Sixth Standard, yet in eleven years the maximum salary of £120 may be reached. When we think of the difference in the examination test, and of the immense difference in the importance of the work, and remember that women teachers have been doing really good work for eighteen or twenty years, have all that time been endeavouring to keep up to date in their profession by taking instruction in drill, drawing, kindergarten work, &c., and have never been able to earn more than £90 a year, we must come to the conclusion that they are suffering great injustice at the hands of the State. As far as the men are concerned, I should be very sorry to see their salaries lowered. I hope the Government will see their way to increase them, but let it not be at the expense of the women. Personally, I do not desire that women should be paid equally well with men, but as discussion on the subject has been proceeding I have been driven further and further into sympathy with those who demand equal pay. I am aware that my position is not a logical one, but based on sentiment—a sentiment that will doubtless disappear with years, and under the influence of public opinion. I do see something in the reasons usually urged for paying women smaller salaries than men—viz., the greater obligations of men, and the loss to the State from the retirement of women teachers soon after receiving their training—but consider that far too much is made of them. Whilst acknowledging that men have greater obligations than women, I maintain that those of women should not be overlooked. I know of women in the profession receiving an insufficient salary, having to support themselves and members of their family, and having only the old-age pension to look forward to. What sadder spectacle is there than a woman too old to work, and dependent upon charity, perhaps grudgingly given? It seems to me that this new spirit of independence in women, this dislike to being a burden on their men relatives, is surely something to be admired and encouraged rather than fought against. Moreover, I am not aware that the argument that men should be paid larger salaries in order to admit of their supporting a wife and family is applied in any other work in which men and women compete. If it is admitted at all, should it not be carried to its logical conclusion, and, all other things being equal, should not the salary be proportionate to the size of the family? With regard to the other point which militates against the raising of the status of women—the fact that so many of them do not remain long in the profession—I feel that there is something in this. Not so much, however, as at first sight appears, for these women should make better mothers for the education and training they have received. I maintain also that those who remain are worthy of more adequate remuneration, and that they should suffer as little as may be for behaviour for which they are in no way responsible. To prevent injustice being done to those women who do remain in the service, who are interested in their profession, and who should be able to look forward to something like a career, there should surely be better positions open to them. From a recent report of the London School Board I have obtained the following facts: There are under the Board 371 boys' schools in which men chiefly are employed; 369 girls' schools in which no men are employed; 390 infants' schools in which, also, no men are employed; twenty-nine smaller schools, mixed, under a master, in which schools both male and female assistants are employed; thirty-eight, mixed under women, in which schools there are altogether five male assistants. The average salary for a headmaster is £337, for a headmistress £252 9s. 5d., for an infants' mistress £231 8s. 11d. The average salary of a headmistress is 75 per cent. of that of a headmaster, and the average salary of a woman assistant is 87 per cent. of that of a man assistant. In one girls' school, with an average of 460, there are no pupil-teachers employed, the lowest salary is £90, and

the highest £300. In another, with an average of 474, and a staff of fourteen, the headmistress is paid £324. When one remembers that the buying-power of money in London is much greater than here, it is evident that women are very much worse paid in New Zealand than at Home. When one observes, too, the number of responsible positions assigned to them, including inspectorships, and the subordinate positions assigned here, it is evident that their status here is much too low, and requires to be raised rather than lowered. Are the members of the London School Board all wrong in intrusting so much important work to women, and the men whose evidence before this Commission opposes such a course all right? Are all girls' schools and girls' departments to be swept away without the fathers and mothers being consulted on the subject? When parents pay for their girls to be educated it is for tuition by women they pay. If they thought it inferior they would assuredly make it their business to secure for their daughters the service of men teachers. The department, I am glad to see, desires to raise the status of infants' mistresses. These women do very important work in the teaching of the little ones and in the training of pupil-teachers. They have large responsibilities, and often very indifferent help. They practically control nearly one-third or one-fourth of the pupils on the school-roll, and, if capable, in the largest schools they do this with almost no supervision from the headmaster, who, however, draws a large part of his salary from his more or less nominal supervision of this department. But the class who in this district are suffering most, and who all over the colony are likely to suffer most, unless the Government can see its way to remedying the evil by increasing the education grant, are the women with the best brains. We encourage the brightest of our girls to go in for scholarships; they get them, proceed to the high school and the university, all this time competing successfully with boys and men. They enter the teaching profession, and find there that all the prizes are for the men. When they might hope to see the reward of their labours they find their way blocked by their sex, which up to this point has been no obstacle. The danger to them is that they are the class of women teachers who have to enter into competition with men, unless provision is made for them, as provision is made for men. I find it hard to believe that the country which had the honour of being the first to open its universities to women, and that the Government which was the first to confer the franchise upon them, can let pass this opportunity of raising the status of the women engaged in this most important work.

508. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I assume that you are in favour of equal payment for men and women—at any rate, up to a certain standard of school?—No, I have not said that. I think the minimum salary for a woman should be £100, and I agree that the minimum salary for a man should be £110.

509. There should be that difference, even at that point?—Yes, I think so.

510. You think that a woman representative should have been on this Commission?—Yes; I think it would have encouraged more women to come forward.

511. Have you thought out any method for improving the prospects of promotion for teachers generally—of course, that includes women?—I do not know that I have. For women in this district there are really no chances of promotion worth mentioning. There are only three positions that one might call good.

512. Which are they?—My own position, the position of infant mistress at the Mount Cook School, and that of infant mistress at Te Aro.

513. Do you not consider the present system of appointing and promoting—if you might call it promoting—unsatisfactory?—I do not know that I do, though something must be wrong, seeing that some women doing good work have had to remain at the same salary for eighteen or twenty years.

514. Suppose a woman teacher has a school of 45 in a country district, what chance of promotion has that teacher unless your Board, or a Committee, select her? Her service does not count in any way?—No.

515. You think that a woman should be intrusted with Standards IV. and V.?—Yes.

516. Would you leave it at the discretion of the headmaster as to whether he should intrust the Sixth Standard to a woman?—Yes.

517. Do you believe in the separation of the sexes in schools?—I do, where possible.

518. Have you thought anything about a superannuation scheme for teachers?—Yes; I think that women should retire at fifty-five years of age.

519. On a pension?—Yes; a large one, if possible.

520. Do you think that the teachers would be prepared to contribute something themselves out of the contemplated increase of salaries?—As far as the women are concerned, we do not know what our increases are to be.

521. Have you studied the alternative scale?—It is not very definite, as far as assistants go; in fact, there is nothing in it to define the positions and salaries of women assistants.

522. *Mr. Davidson.*] Did I understand you to say that you have never taught in a mixed school?—I have not.

523. You stated that personally you do not desire equal pay for equal work for the sexes, but I suppose you do desire that the too great disparity should be reduced?—Yes.

524. If all schools in the colony having an average attendance of under 40—over a thousand altogether—were thrown open to either sex, and all assistantships at larger schools, with the exception of the first-assistantships at large mixed schools, do you think that would be treating women fairly?—I think the women would be pretty well satisfied with that.

525. Then, with regard to salaries, suppose, as you suggested, the disparity at present existing between the salaries paid to men and those paid to women was considerably reduced, do you think the salary question would be fairly well settled as far as the sole teachers at schools of under 40 are concerned?—I think so.

526. What difference would you suggest should be made in the salaries paid to assistants occupying similar positions, male and female?—When we considered this question we came to the conclusion that the first woman assistant should receive a salary of 75 per cent. of that paid to the male assistant occupying a similar position, the next 80 per cent., and the next 90 per cent., roughly speaking. The more I consider the subject the more I am inclined to still further reduce the disparity.

527. You notice that in the first scale the positions of the assistants alternated as far as the sexes were concerned?—Yes.

528. Did you approve of that?—I approved of it, inasmuch as it seemed to provide better positions for women than they had hitherto had here.

529. You stated that in Dunedin a lady gave evidence to the effect that women were unequal to the task of teaching standards above the Third?—No; I think she said above the Fourth. I understood that she said that they did not wish to teach higher standards than the Fourth.

530. Do you know that that lady referred to large classes in mixed schools?—Yes, I gathered so.

531. She said that she had been teaching all the standards in a small school: so that you qualify that statement by saying that she referred to large standards in mixed schools?—Yes.

532. Do you think the average woman is physically—we know perfectly well she is mentally—capable of standing the strain of teaching these large standards in mixed schools?—Personally, I have had no experience of this kind of work, but I do know women here who seem to be able to stand the strain well enough.

533. Then, you entirely disagree with those witnesses who have stated that these positions—*i.e.*, teaching the Fourth and higher standards in the large mixed schools—should be kept for men only?—Yes. There are women in this district who feel that they are equal to teaching Standard V. They do not desire to teach the Sixth and Seventh Standards, because they do not think it would be in the interests of the boys.

534. Then, you would approve of such a scale as would make provision for exceptional women who desired to teach, say, the Fourth or Fifth Standards, even in our large mixed schools?—Yes.

535. *Mr. Stewart.*] What is the feeling of the lady teachers of Wellington in regard to the colonial scale in principle?—If it could be proved that it would materially increase their salaries, of course they would approve of it; but at present we are in the dark with regard to the colonial scale so far as it concerns us.

536. The question I wish to put to you is this: Irrespective of any proposals that have been made, do you believe there should be a colonial scale, or do you think each individual Board should retain the right to pay according to its own scale?—I think it would give more satisfaction to the women if a colonial scale were introduced.

537. You mean to say that the women teachers of Wellington are in favour of a colonial scale in the abstract?—Yes, I think so.

538. Have you had any experience as to the comparative absences of men and women on school staffs through sickness?—No, only from hearsay. Those on my own staff have been absent very little indeed.

539. Have you any men on your staff?—No.

540. *Mr. Luke.*] From your experience as principal of a large school, do you think there is any material difference in the physical and mental strain in taking charge of the Fifth Standard and a lower standard?—Yes; I consider the Fifth the most difficult of those standards.

541. You stated that you thought there should be some difference between the salaries paid to males and females: will you tell us more particularly why you think so?—Chiefly for these two reasons: that so many women leave the service soon after receiving their training that I cannot think their services are so valuable to the State on the whole; secondly, I have a sort of sentimental feeling for the wives and children of those schoolmasters whose salaries we might be lowering.

542. *Mr. Hill.*] Is your school staffed the same by the Education Board as the mixed and boys' schools?—I think so.

543. They allow you the same staffing as for a mixed school of similar size?—Yes; I have five assistants and seven pupil-teachers.

544. Some of them hold certificates already?—Some ex-pupil-teachers—certificated teachers—are doing assistants' work at pupil-teachers' pay.

545. I notice that, according to this return, the lady teachers at your school hold higher certificates than those held by the male assistants at the Mount Cook Boys' School: is that so?—If it is in that return I suppose it is so.

546. Have you estimated the amount of money that is obtained by capitation on your school?—I made a calculation the other day, but I have forgotten the figures.

547. Your average attendance is returned at 494?—Yes.

548. And the average attendance at the Boys' School is 523?—Yes.

549. The income derived by the Board for the Boys' School is £1,961 5s., and for the Girls £1,852 10s.; whereas the salaries payable to the teachers at the Boys' School amount to £1,415, and to the teachers at the Girls' School £1,062 10s.: you are aware that the capitation per head allowed for your girls is the same as that allowed for the boys?—Yes.

550. Have you ever drawn the attention of your Board to that difference?—No.

551. Have you not felt that you were entitled to some special consideration in connection with the salaries of your girl teachers?—Oh, yes.

552. I suppose that the Inspectors expect and require as much efficiency from your staff as that at the Boys' School?—Yes; and we have the sewing as well.

553. The profit on your school—*i.e.*, the amount by which the capitation allowance exceeds the amount paid in salaries—is £790, and on the Boys' School £546?—Yes.

554. Do you not think that your staff deserves a larger sum in salaries than is paid to it?—Yes, very much larger—especially the lower assistants.

555. Here on this list is shown a lady teacher at your school with a D1 certificate; she has £90 a year: how many children has she to teach?—The number varies in different years.

556. What standard does she teach?—Standard V.

557. Two others receive £90 a year each; they have been teaching twenty years and that is all they can get: is that so?—Yes.

558. Have they never made application for a school outside?—I think, in both cases home circumstances have prevented that.

559. Then, it is really a question of home circumstances?—In both cases they have obligations which keep them here.

560. You have read over the scale suggested by the Inspector-General: would it affect you at all as the principal of that school?—I think my salary would be just about the same if that scale were adopted.

561. In what way would it affect your assistants?—That I cannot say, because, according to the scale, an infant mistress would be put into the staff, and that we do not require.

562. This proposed supplementary scale for separate boys', girls', or infants' schools would give your first assistant £175; second, £130; third, £115; fourth, £100; fifth, £85; and sixth, £80: would you be satisfied with such a scale as that?—Yes, I think so.

563. Do you think there is too wide a difference between those salaries?—Yes, between the first and second.

564. Would you approximate them more closely?—Yes.

565. What do you suggest should be given to the second assistant—£150?—I should be very glad if that salary were paid to her.

566. Do you think the position of first assistant is worth £170 or £175; and do you think £150 fair for the second assistant?—Yes, I think those two salaries fair.

567. Do you think it possible to adopt a system that would improve the staff at your school in the way of eliminating the factor of pupil-teachers?—I think that we have far too many pupil-teachers.

568. Do you think it would be possible to adopt a plan whereby, before they begin to teach, young teachers should receive previous training in the art of school-management and instruction in methods, and the reasons for their adoption?—It would be a very great help if that could be done.

569. Is not the present plan one which gives no chance to young pupil-teachers in their first year to obtain any real technical training, such as they ought to have when going into an important position as a pupil-teacher?—I believe so.

570. You believe it would greatly benefit the education given in schools in this colony if proper arrangements were made for early training?—Yes.

571. Now, assuming that you had such pupil-teachers, and it were found desirable to continue their instruction, do you think all the certificated teachers on your staff should partake in the instruction of those pupil-teachers?—No; I think the head-teacher should do it all.

572. The literary preparation and also the technical training?—I thought you meant the preparation of pupil-teachers for examinations.

573. If you increase the salaries, do you not think that, instead of paying separately for the instruction of pupil-teachers, the salaries should be deemed to include payment not merely for the instruction, but for the training of pupil-teachers? Do you not think it would tend to improve the junior division of your school?—Do you mean that they should not receive any training at a training-college?

574. Afterwards, by scholarships—I refer to their early preparation?—Yes.

575. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] We were told in Wanganui that it was a fact that five out of six lady teachers became hard and selfish, and put all the money they earned on their own backs or heads: do you think there is any truth in that? Do you know of any number of lady teachers who have parents to support?—From my experience, I should say that about half of the lady teachers help some members of their families.

576. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you know what your salary would be under the suggested supplementary scale?—I made a rough calculation, and found that I would get possibly a pound or two more, that is, if allowed house allowance.

577. Taking your average attendance as 456, the first assistant would get £170; at present she gets £150, and the second assistant £100—a difference of £50; according to the proposed scale, the second assistant would get £125, but still there is too much difference: do you not think so?—Yes, there is too great a difference between £170 for the first assistant and £125 for the second assistant. As a matter of fact, the second assistant teaches Standard VI., and it is much harder work than Standard VII.

578. You do not give the first assistant the hardest work?—The first assistant has gone through that standard—*i.e.*, VI.

579. At present you are giving the second assistant the hardest work in the school?—I consider it the hardest.

580. The third assistant gets £90?—Yes.

581. A salary of £115 would be a considerable increase?—Yes.

582. You say you have five assistants?—Yes.

583. Is there a vacancy at your school at present?—No. I have an ex-pupil-teacher getting £50 a year and teaching Standard IV. She, I hope, will be made an assistant.

584. You had six assistants in the December quarter, did you not?—Miss Williams left about the middle of the year. She met with a serious accident. The Board paid her salary for some four or five months. Then she resigned.

585. Her place has not been filled?—No, except by a pupil-teacher.

586. The salaries proposed to be paid to all the assistants at your school by the suggested supplementary scale are higher than those that are being paid: is that not so?—Yes.

587. What is the highest salary payable under your Board's regulations to a female assistant in a mixed school?—At present, I think, not counting the infant mistress, it is only £100.

588. What is the highest salary payable to a mistress at a mixed school according to this proposed scale?—£180.

589. With regard to small schools, have you compared the salaries for mistresses under the suggested scale with the salaries paid to mistresses at present?—I know so little about small schools that I have not made any calculation.

590. *The Chairman.*] You say you think there are too many pupil-teachers?—Yes.

591. I suppose you are aware that there are a great many applications from young people?—Yes.

592. What do you think the fact of the applications being so numerous is owing to?—I think a great many girls have an idea that it is rather a superior thing to be a teacher, but later on they find out that it is harder work than they had anticipated.

593. Are the applicants generally eligible: do they comprise the clever girls?—Whilst I have been in charge of the school the applicants have included some of the girls who have taken scholarships and gone to the high school. They have also included some girls whom I thought quite unfit to be teachers.

594. Do you know whether the Board have had any difficulty in getting good, strong applicants for pupil-teacherships?—I do not think so. I have frequently heard it said of late by girls that they would prefer to get into the Telephone Exchange or other department of the Government if possible.

595. Have you ever heard of the difficulty of getting into the telephone service?—Yes.

596. Have you heard of the number of names in hand?—Some hundreds; six hundred in Christchurch alone, I think.

597. I presume that under the present method you receive payment for instructing pupil-teachers?—No; I do not instruct the pupil-teachers at all; they are taught chiefly by the first assistant masters.

598. Are the first assistant masters paid for the work?—Yes.

599. Do you think there would be equally good results if they were not paid specially for the work?—You could not expect the first assistant masters to do it unless they were specially paid for the work. I think each head-teacher ought to take his own pupil-teachers. That is the system that prevails in Canterbury; and, judging by results, there is no comparison between the two systems.

600. Do you think the same amount of attention would be devoted to those pupil-teachers, and they would be coached in a similar way for their examinations, if no special payments were made to either the headmasters or the first assistants—if it were simply a matter of duty covered by their salaries?—I think it might be advisable to allow the special payments, and, if the pupil-teachers did not pass, to pay only half-fees.

601. You admit that a difference should be made between the payment of male and female teachers for doing the same work: what difference do you think would be fair and equitable?—It is difficult to state any particular percentage, because it would depend upon the salary; but a woman should be paid from 75 per cent. to 80 per cent. of a man's salary, the disparity decreasing as you go down.

602. Is there great reluctance on the part of some of your lady assistants in the large centres, such as Wellington, to go into the country and take charge of schools there?—Yes; a much greater reluctance in Wellington than in some other districts—Canterbury, for instance. I think that is owing to the country here not being so forward as regards settlement, roads, and railways.

603. Life in the bush country is looked upon as being very rough?—Yes; I think any teacher who goes there deserves large compensation.

604. Do you think the salaries paid at the present time to the lady teachers in charge of small country schools are adequate?—I think very good salaries are being paid in the Wellington District to teachers in charge of country schools, as compared with those paid in other districts.

605. But do you think they are sufficient?—I think they are, on the whole.

SATURDAY, 22ND JUNE, 1901.

Mrs. C. A. FRANCIS, Headmistress, Mount Cook Infants' School, examined.

Mrs. Francis: I am headmistress of a separate infants' school—the Mount Cook Infants' School—and am deputed by the other mistresses of separate infant-schools to ask that our position be made clear. According to the proposed scale it would seem that we are not provided for at all. We are heads of separate schools, but it appears from the scale that we may be classed as infant mistresses or first assistant mistresses. Nothing is said in the scale about the mistresses of separate infant-schools—there is nothing to prove that our position would be assured to us. In the scale "infant mistress" appears to mean an infant mistress under a master. Now, is that so?

Mr. Stewart: I think it is perfectly clear that the words "infant mistress" in the scale apply only to mistresses who form part of the staff of an organized school, and not to those in charge of separate infants' schools.

The Chairman: Mistresses of separate schools are not provided for in the scale.

Mr. Hill: I would suggest that Mrs. Francis give her reasons why her school should be carried on separately from another school.

Mrs. Francis: I am speaking not only for myself, but also for two other separate infants' schools in the Wellington District—Te Aro and Masterton. These schools are in a different street

from the upper schools. There is a headmistress to each of them, and they are independent of any other school. We teach the kindergarten lessons, and our classes include the First Standard. Those who pass Standard I., though taught at the separate infant-schools, are not counted as passed in our schools; they are put on the roll of the upper schools, and counted to them, though the instruction has been given by us.

606. *Mr. Hill.*] Do I understand you to say that your school is counted in the official returns as forming part of the other school?—No; it is a separate school entirely. I refer to those only who have passed the First Standard.

The Chairman: These schools are entirely independent of any other school; the headmasters of the larger schools have no control whatever over them.

Mrs. Francis: These schools would have to be shut up if the proposals of the headmasters were carried out. One of their proposals is that there should be no children over seven in an infants' school. Now, 163 children out of the 445 at my school are over seven, and yet some are only in the letter class and some in the first primer. Some 45 or 50 children over seven are not in the First Standard. Now, what is the use of sending those children who do not know their letters, or who cannot read, to an upper school? You say, Why have they not learnt their letters and learnt to read? Because numbers of them do not come until they are seven or over. Are you to have infant-teachers and kindergarten-teachers at the upper schools for them? We protest against the children being sent to upper schools when there are separate infants' schools, unless they can pass the Second Infant Reader at least. These three schools are conducted by women of experience; they are women who have given their time to the teaching of young children; and, though they do not actually teach every class, every class goes through their hands every day. We have few adult teachers at these three schools: we have probationers, who are sent to our schools straight from the high school or other schools to take charge of a class. I have at my school one assistant, four probationers, and four pupil-teachers to teach an average number of nearly 400. We protest against the children being moved up because they are seven years old, irrespective of their attainments. Inspectors have written in our log-books, "These schools are a good foundation for young children, and no children should be pushed into the First Standard before they are ready." A good First Standard child, we know, passes all the standards. Then, again, the parents of the children do not care for them to be moved so long as they are progressing in the infant-school: they do not care for their little children to go among the older ones before they are obliged. As far as we can see, the only reason for the headmasters making such a proposition is to swell the numbers at their schools. I might also point out that I have sent children over eight years of age to the upper schools again and again, and have been told that they have no room for them there until after the examination. Only the other day a girl of ten was refused because they had no room for her. As the year draws on the upper school is very full, and I have to keep the children till after the examination. We suggest that if the headmasters and mistresses of the upper schools want more pupils than they have room for, let the children go when they can pass a preparatory examination. We get no credit for passing them into the Second Standard, for they are always counted to the upper schools, and must make those upper schools' passes look very well. Another point: Would a master who had his own infants' department in his own building say to the infant mistress, "That child is seven years old; whether he can read or not he must come into my school"? No, of course he would not. If the proposals of the masters were agreed to I should not have an average of 250 at my school, and it would be closed. There is another point that I wish to refer to. These separate infants' schools have been acknowledged by the Inspectors year after year to be good training-schools for young teachers. They come to us as probationers. The principal part of the time of the headmistress at these schools is spent in giving lessons to classes, not altogether for the benefit of the children, but partly for the benefit of those young pupil-teachers. These teachers stay perhaps a year, and go through all the classes; and headmasters have repeatedly said to me, "That is a good teacher that you sent me the other day." Some of them, of course, do not turn out good teachers, but that is not my fault, for sometimes I report them as incompetent to my Board, and if the Board keeps them on I cannot help it. We want our position to be plainly defined. We are headmistresses of separate schools; but we shall not be if you take all children over seven, irrespective of their abilities, out of our schools. We think that first-year pupil-teachers and probationers should not be placed in charge of a large class until they have had three months' experience at a school. I think that a first-year pupil-teacher should never have to teach more than 30 children.

607. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you know whether the same School Commmittee has charge of the Mount Cook Boys', Mount Cook Girls', and Mount Cook Infants' Schools?—Yes, one Committee.

608. I notice that in the Minister's report those three schools are considered as one?—Not by the Board or the Committee. We have our own funds and our own reports.

609. What is your present staff?—One assistant, four pupil-teachers, and four probationers, besides myself.

610. You have a staff of ten, counting yourself?—Yes, ten; but we think probationers should not be counted as teachers.

611. Do you think the Board is treating you fairly by asking you to teach, and teach efficiently, such a large number of pupils with that staff?—The teachers at my school go out relieving a great deal. When I write to the Board complaining that I am understaffed they tell me they have no more teachers.

612. Do you think it is in the interests of the children that the constant changing of teachers that you have referred to should take place?—No. Ever since I have been here the staff has been changed every year. What I object to is the probationers being counted as pupil-teachers when they cannot do the work. It is unfair to the children, to the pupil-teacher, and to me.

613. You have the First Standard in what is called the Infants' School?—Yes.

614. Do you examine the children for promotion into the Second Standard?—No; the Inspector does.

615. *Mr. Stewart.*] How far is your school from the main Mount Cook School?—In the next street.

616. Would it be an eigth of a mile away?—Fully that, I should think, if not more.

617. You keep the children up to the time they pass the First Standard?—Our regulations are that children may be in the infants' schools till they are eight years old, so we teach them as far as they will go.

618. Irrespective of what standard they pass?—They never pass more than the First Standard in any school.

619. What is your salary now?—£200, and £40 house allowance.

620. Supposing your school were taken as a part of the Mount Cook School, have you calculated what salary you would receive?—No.

621. Do you understand that the question of schools of this kind is for the Board, and we have nothing to do with it?—That is what we wanted—that our position should be made clear.

622. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Is there sufficient accommodation, as far as the rooms are concerned, at your school for teaching these infants?—Seating-accommodation is provided for 480.

623. Is it not a fact that a number of the probationers or pupil-teachers are teaching in the same room?—Yes; but that does not matter, as we have the quiet lessons. We have galleries and desks.

624. Would it not be more suitable if you had assistants instead of these pupil-teachers and probationers?—I think that one assistant at an infant-school is enough; some of the girls are quite as capable of teaching the infants as an assistant.

625. Do you not consider that you have too many pupil-teachers and probationers?—I do not have enough.

626. According to the return for 1899 you had eleven pupil-teachers?—Yes; I had nearly my full staff then.

627. Are you short-handed now?—Yes.

628. Do I understand that the Board do not take sufficient notice of the representations of the head-teachers and Inspectors with regard to the staffing of the school?—I do not say or think that. I think the Board do not wish to increase the number of their pupil-teachers at present. They say they have no pupil-teachers to send me, and so they cannot send any.

629. Do you not consider that the Wellington Board employs far too many pupil-teachers—more than they can find positions for afterwards?—I am speaking with regard to my own school: I do not want more than one assistant. I think we can do our work very well with pupil-teachers.

630. Do I understand that the suggested scale of staffs and salaries would not suit a school like yours?—My school is not provided for; that is where the difficulty is.

Mr. Davidson: Mr. Chairman, there is separate provision made for such schools in a circular issued by the Inspector-General. The circular, a copy of which I have here, was put in as an exhibit. [Circular shown to witness.]

Mrs. Francis: I have not seen that circular before.

Mr. Gilfedder: There is no doubt that gets over the difficulty.

Mrs. Francis: Then, I have wasted your time and my own; but the limit of 250 will close some schools.

631. *Mr. Hill.*] You recognise yourself as the headmistress of the Mount Cook Infants' School?—Yes; I was appointed as that.

632. How many years have you been in charge?—Twenty-three.

633. Who is the headmaster of the Mount Cook Boys' School?—Mr. Hardy.

634. Does Mr. Hardy ever go to your school?—Yes, occasionally, but simply as a visitor.

635. In the departmental regulations of your Board the following appears, referring to salaries and staffing: "This shall include those teachers who are in charge of the infant department of the main school only where such infant department is carried on in a separate building, but shall nevertheless be under the supervision of the head-teacher of the main school to which it is attached, and shall include Thorndon, Newtown, Clyde Quay, and such other schools as may be hereafter placed on this list by the Board": do you think that refers to your school at all?—No; Newtown has an infants' school in its own grounds, and so has Thorndon and Clyde Quay Schools.

636. But it says "such other schools as may hereafter be placed on the list": has your school ever been placed on that list?—Never.

637. Your school is absolutely independent of control or supervision by Mr. Hardy?—Yes.

638. He would be intruding on your work if he even suggested to you as to any improvement?—He would not think of doing so.

639. You do not think the headmaster of a boys' school should suggest to a lady teacher at all?—It would be out of place for him to do so; he has no authority to do so.

640. Let us now come back to the proposed scale of the Inspector-General: suppose that you received the same amount of money under that scale that you are receiving now, do you think it would make much difference to you?—Thirty-five years' teaching and then come to be an assistant teacher! I am afraid I should have to resign

641. But it is simply the name?—Are people's feelings nothing?

642. If you were placed in charge of the infants' department under a master, would it affect your position at all?—Yes.

643. Do you think that you could not receive a suggestion from anybody?—I think not; I think my experience of infants is far greater than that of any master who might be placed over me.

644. But there are new things coming into the world?—Every catalogue respecting kindergarten and other teaching is forwarded to me, and there is not one lesson in last year's catalogues, either new books or new lessons, that we have not employed in our school.

645. Do you think that constant changing is good for your teachers?—My teachers are never very long with me.

646. Then, so much more reason why you should centre your work on special lines of training?—You do not quite understand the kindergarten lessons. We do, say, paper-plaiting one year; perhaps the next year we do not do those lessons. The teachers have learnt them, and can give instruction when they go to another school.

647. Have you any special scheme of instruction prepared for your training?—Yes.

648. Could we see it?—Yes.

649. Do you think that the giving of special classes to probationers is a good thing for the schools?—I do not mean that; what I say is that a teacher should not come into a school and have to take charge of a class straight away. We have never had it done till lately.

650. Are they compelled to take charge of a class now, for example, when they come to you?—Yes; I have eight classes of boys and eight of girls, sixteen altogether, but we combine the two. I have now nine teachers, counting probationers.

651. You are compelled to place these probationers in charge of classes?—Yes; I go round myself, and teach the children a lesson here and there.

652. Do you feel that your staffing is sufficient?—I have not such a "big family" as I used to have.

653. The salaries of the teachers at your school amount to about £600 a year, whereas £1,400 is received on account of average attendance: do you think that your school can be carried on efficiently on your present staffing?—Not on my present staff.

654. Your staff at present is insufficient?—Yes.

655. It would be far more in the interests of your school if you had a stronger staff?—Yes; but I think the weakness of my staff is only temporary.

656. For how long have you been short-handed?—Since Christmas; up to that time my staff was as usual.

657. According to this list which I have here, you have a great number of pupil-teachers at your school at salaries of from £20 to £30?—Some of these are probationers.

658. Did you when you had your usual staff feel that it was sufficient?—Yes.

659. You think it is a very important thing to lay a good foundation?—Yes.

660. Have these probationers had any previous training when they come to you?—Very few have been moved to my school, and if they have been to other schools they have really come to my school to learn the kindergarten system only.

661. They stay with you only about twelve months?—Different times: some from the country for only a few days, being sent by Inspectors or headmasters to see the kindergarten work in my school.

662. Do you think your school sufficiently staffed under such conditions?—They would not be counted as members of the staff when they stayed for only a few days.

663. *Mr. Weston.*] You told us just now that your teaching staff was composed of pupil-teachers and probationers?—And one assistant.

664. These probationers come to you inexperienced, do they not?—Yes, from school.

665. All of them do not prove successes?—No.

666. What do you do in the school when you find one or more of the probationers incompetent?—I help them all I can myself.

667. While these probationers are incompetent, and while you are trying to improve them, do not the children in the school suffer?—I do not let them suffer more than I can help.

668. Do they or do they not suffer?—They certainly suffer in discipline.

669. What percentage of these probationers prove successes?—A large percentage; 90 per cent., if not more, prove successful.

670. In the instruction of infant children is it not necessary for the mistress to be in touch with the children, to understand their little ways, and, indeed, to know all about them?—Certainly; that is why we are there.

671. Is it possible for probationers staying there, as you say, for a week upwards to understand the children sufficiently to enable them to derive the fullest benefit from the teaching of the school?—Certainly it is; if they, the children, can take it in.

672. Do you think that, although these probationers may be there, some of them for a week only, the children can derive efficient instruction?—I never said probationers were with me for only a week; those that stay only a week are extra teachers; they are not on my staff.

673. They are extras?—Yes; they do not teach at all; they are not really teachers belonging to the school, but visiting for information in kindergarten work.

674. Taking you to your probationers proper—if I may use the term—how long do they remain with you?—As a rule, they stay till they go through the school; they learn all the different grades and classes till they have taught the First Standard, and then if they succeed they are good junior teachers.

675. How long would all that take?—It depends on how often the Board moves them; sometimes they stay six months, and sometimes two years.

676. And sometimes a week?—I had one who stayed only a few weeks—but that was because she resigned.

677. Do you think that all the children in your school have received, and are receiving, the best education that they should get under you?—Not unless I have my full staff; not under

present circumstances. But I think the Board cannot help themselves just now; they do not want to get more teachers.

678. Pupil-teachers have to study, do they not?—Yes.

679. Do you think that pupil-teachers of the age of the girls now with you should devote the whole of their day to teaching, and have to study after hours?—I think they should never be appointed till they have matriculated; that gives the girls less study when they are appointed. They can teach well if they have matriculated.

680. But if they have not matriculated do you think their time should be divided between theory and practice?—I think it is drudgery; that is what it is.

681. Do you think that their time should be divided?—I do not think we should have them at all; we have the pick of applicants who have matriculated, and why should not they be taken instead of the Sixth Standard girls?

682. Do you find that the girls are able physically to stand the racket of the daily work in your school, *plus* study?—Some can and some cannot; weak-chested girls with weak voices should never be appointed.

683. *The Chairman.*] Is any provision made for the admission of infants to the Mount Cook Boys' School or the Mount Cook Girls' School without going through yours?—They are not supposed to, but in some cases they do. If the children are bright, age is not counted by the headmaster of the Boys' School.

684. Have they any infants' classes at those two schools?—I do not know. I think they must have infants' classes, but cannot say from my own knowledge.

685. It does not appear to be optional to parents, then, whether they send their children to your school first, or one of the others—they must send the children to yours first?—I think they are always glad to do so.

686. Are you acquainted with the positions of the other separate infants' schools that you referred to? Take the one at Te Aro?—Yes; I think, from the consultation that we had, that Miss Chatwin's school must be much on the same lines as mine.

687. Is the building there near the main school?—About an eighth of a mile.

688. The principal thing that you object to is the proposal to take away the independence of the separate infants' schools?—I hold that a separate infants' school is of great assistance to an upper school.

689. How long has your Infants' School been in existance?—Twenty-three years; I came from Australia to open it, as a kindergarten expert.

690. During that time have there been any complaints about it—about the kind of work done?—I do not think so; you would not think so if you saw the reports on it from the children's parents, the headmasters, and the Inspectors.

691. Do you think any improvement in the education of the children would be brought about if the recommendations of the headmasters were carried out, and children were transferred on reaching seven years of age?—Then they would have to have infant work in their schools.

692. But do you think it would be beneficial to the children?—I am not going to say that, for doing so would acknowledge that I cannot teach them.

693. Then, you think there is no reason, as far as you are aware, for making any alteration in the existing system in the direction indicated?—The headmasters have supplied us with no reason for this recommendation.

694. Do you think it would be of benefit to the children if you kept them a little longer and taught them another standard?—We would not have room.

695. But suppose the building was enlarged?—I do not see any object in that.

696. You do not ask for it?—I do not ask to teach them beyond the First Standard; I ask that children shall not be moved to the upper schools till they have passed the Second Infants' Reader at least.

697. You say you have not a full staff at present: how many teachers are you short?—My staff should be an assistant, eight pupil-teachers, and four probationers.

698. How many have you got at present?—An assistant, four pupil-teachers, and four probationers.

699. Then, you are four pupil-teachers short?—Yes; but, as I say, it is not usual. The Board does not know quite what to do while these proposed changes are about; they do not want a number of pupil-teachers on their hands.

FRANCIS BENNETT, Headmaster Karori School, examined.

Mr. Bennett: I have been appointed to represent the masters of schools with an average attendance of from 100 to 300, and on their behalf I wish briefly to put before you our views with regard to the various questions that have been raised for our consideration. We all look with a great amount of satisfaction on the prospect of an increase in the staffing of the schools; but, as far as our schools are concerned, we are much exercised over the two schemes of salaries submitted for our consideration. I have prepared a table comparing the salaries paid to the schoolmasters whom I represent by the Wellington Education Board with the salaries under the proposed scheme, and also under the alternative scheme. I have taken the average attendances and the salaries from "Table No. 8, List of the Public Schools, December, 1899," in the Minister's report. I will take the schools in order. Mangatainoka is the first; the average attendance stated is 160; the salary paid to the headmaster £265; under the first proposed scheme it would be from £219 to £229. This does not include house allowance, as a house is provided, and would mean a loss to the headmaster of from £46 to £36. Under the alternative scale the salary would be from £237 to £252—a loss of from £28 to £13. The next is the Pahiatua School. The average attendance stated there is 228, and the salary paid £285. In this case also a house is provided. Under the proposed scale

the salary would be from £249 to £259, leaving a loss of from £36 to £26. According to the alternative scale the salary would be from £252 to £262, leaving a loss of £33 to £23. Eketahuna is the next school. The average is set down as 112, and the salary £245. Under the proposed scheme the salary would be £189 to £219, leaving a loss of from £56 to £26; under the alternative scheme the salary would be from £210 to £225, showing a loss of from £35 to £20. Carterton School: Average attendance 280, salary £275; under the proposed scale, £259 to £274, resulting in a loss of from £26 to £1. I cannot tell you what it would be under the alternative scale, as I have no data to go upon. Greytown School: Average attendance 207, salary £285; under the proposed scheme, from £229 to £249, resulting in a loss of from £56 to £36; salary under alternative scheme, from £252 to £262—loss, £33 to £23. Featherston School: Average attendance 145, salary stated £255; under proposed scale, £189 to £219, showing a loss of from £66 to £36; under alternative scheme, from £225 to £237, resulting in a loss of from £30 to £18. Upper Hutt: Average attendance 126, salary stated £235; under proposed scheme, £189 to £219—loss, from £46 to £16; under alternative scale, £225 to £237, resulting in from a loss of £10 to a gain of £2. Hutt School: Average attendance 202, salary stated £295; under proposed scale, £229 to £249, the loss being from £66 to £46, under alternative scale, £252 to £262—loss, from £43 to £33.

Mr. Stewart: It would be of great assistance if the witness would say whether a house is provided or not.

Mr. Bennett: In every instance so far a house is provided. The next school is Levin: Average attendance 125, salary stated £235; salary under proposed scheme, from £189 to £219, resulting in a loss of from £46 to £16; salary under alternative scheme, £225 to £237, resulting in a loss of £10 to a gain of £2. Johnsonville School: Average attendance 140, salary (deducting £20 for house allowance) £235; under proposed scheme, £189 to £219, resulting in a loss of from £46 to £16; salary under alternative scheme, £225 to £237, resulting in a loss of £10 to a gain of £2. Karori School: Attendance 135, salary stated £245; salary under proposed scheme, £189 to £219, the loss being from £56 to £26; salary under alternative scheme, £225 to £237, a loss of from £20 to £8.

Mr. Weston: Is the witness referring, in regard to the Wellington scale, to the salaries actually paid, or merely paper salaries?

Mr. Bennett: The salaries I am quoting are those actually paid, obtained from the return I have here. The next school I will take is Roseneath: Average attendance 105, salary stated £275, less house allowance £50, £225; salary under proposed scheme, £189 to £219, resulting in a loss of from £36 to £6; salary under alternative scheme, £210 to £225, resulting in from a loss of £15 to an even sum. Brooklyn School: Average attendance 180, salary stated £275, which, I think, includes £20 house allowance, leaving £255; the salary under the proposed scheme would be from £229 to £249, a loss of from £26 to £6; under the alternative scheme, £237 to £252, showing a loss of from £18 to £3. Kilbirnie School: Average attendance 121, salary stated £235; salary under proposed scheme, £189 to £219, the loss being from £46 to £16; under alternative scheme, £225 to £237, resulting in a loss of £10 to a gain of £2. I would now refer you to the Kaiwarra School: Average attendance 106, salary stated £290, but deducting house allowance, £30, £260; salary under proposed scheme, £189 to £219, a loss of from £71 to £41; under alternative scheme, £210 to £225, resulting in a loss of from £50 to £35. Those are all the schools that come within an average of from 100 to 300, excepting Mitchelltown, which I will not take because it has not been under a master. I would like to point out that in the proposed scale, page 2, in the table dealing with "Head or sole teacher," it is stated that the proposed salary for an average of 100 is £189, and that the present scales in New Zealand run from £160 to £225; the proposed salary of £189 is £3 10s. less than the average paid according to the various New Zealand scales.

Mr. Hogben: You cannot find the average by adding £160 to £225 and halving the total. There are a greater number of schools where the salary is nearer £160.

Mr. Bennett: Yes, that is so. After a careful study of the above comparisons, no one will wonder that we look upon the proposed change with some anxiety, nay, with some alarm, as far as our schools are concerned. Of the above-mentioned schools very few would have a remote chance of an increase, and of the three scales—*i.e.*, the proposed scale, the alternative, and that of the Wellington Education Board—we should prefer the latter; and if we must make a choice between the proposed and the alternative scales, we should prefer the alternative. I wish to forcibly point out that the losses quoted above do not include the additional loss of the pay for the tuition of pupil-teachers, nor do they include the loss of house allowance where a residence is not provided. The loss in fees for instruction of pupil-teachers varies from £10 to £21 per annum. I am taking the staffs as set down in this Table 8. The fees allowed for the passing of the first pupil-teacher would be £10; for the second pupil-teacher, £5; and then, if the next one be a pupil-teacher, we would get £3; if a matriculated student, simply studying, say, two or three subjects, like science or school-management, £1 10s. would be allowed. House allowance amounts to £20 a year. Those items must be added to the losses already mentioned. May I further be allowed to point out that we, in common with any country or suburban head-teacher, must give pupil-teachers instruction, either before or after school-hours, for at least four hours a week. Again, most of us teach from two to four upper standards, and this compels us to correct most, if not all, the paper-work after school-hours. To do this we are almost obliged to take the work home, especially during the winter-time. If either scheme be adopted, financial arrangements many of us may have entered into will probably be interfered with. From the schools which I represent, the city headmasters will in all probability be chosen in the future. We are of the opinion that our salaries should be proportionate to theirs, as they are free from being bound to a class, and do not instruct pupil-teachers out of school-hours. Our salaries, we consider, should be much in excess of the salaries paid to first assistants at the large city schools, or the larger schools. We are also of the opinion that long and successful service should be specially rewarded. In

noting the certificate required for larger schools, we think that a D1 certificated efficient teacher is quite capable, with sufficient experience, of taking charge of the largest schools. With regard to the lowering of teachers' certificates at any time, we hold views strongly opposed to the proposition. Our experience has proved that if the following proposal were carried into effect it would be a great benefit to the schools concerned: In mixed schools of from 150, or not higher than 180, in average attendance, if the head-teacher be either a master or a mistress the first assistant should be a master.

700. *Mr. Hogben.*] No infant mistress?—There would be an infant mistress before that, or, at any rate, an assistant mistress. A high certificate, in our opinion, is not as valuable as long and efficient service, and we think that experienced teachers should not be penalised unless it can be proved that they have neglected favourable opportunities of improvement.

701. *Mr. Davidson.*] What teaching experience have you had?—Twenty-nine years.

702. What class of position have you held?—I taught for seven years in England—five years as a pupil-teacher, and two as a first assistant—and in New Zealand have been in this Board's service for the last twenty-two years. I have had charge of all classes of schools up to an average of 300, besides serving as first assistant at a Wellington City school, and in other capacities.

703. You have taught as a sole teacher in a country school?—Yes.

704. In your opinion, what is the highest average attendance a sole teacher should be asked to teach, without any assistance?—I should say 38, because in some districts the attendance varies very much on wet days and on exceptional occasions.

705. Then, your opinion coincides very nearly with that expressed in the alternative scale, where assistance is allowed at 40?—Yes.

706. What form should the assistance take?—I should advise that an experienced pupil-teacher, of, say, the third year, should be placed in a school of that sort—not a probationer.

707. From 40 to what average attendance would you advise that staffing?—From 38 to, say, 60 or 65.

708. With regard to the next grade of school, what would you recommend as the limit of that grade—65 to what number?—65 to 85 or 90.

709. Say 90. Then you approve of a fully certificated assistant being employed in that grade of schools?—Yes.

710. The suggested staffing is a head-teacher and a fully qualified assistant at from 65 to 90?—Yes.

711. What would you take as the next grade of school—90 to 120?—Yes.

712. There you would have an addition of a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

713. Then, on the whole, you approve of the suggested staff under the alternative scale?—With those variations that I have mentioned.

714. In your statement to the Commission you gave the average attendance of certain schools, the present salary, the salary under the suggested scale, and the salary under the alternative scale: have you compared the salaries at present paid with the salaries that would be paid according to the Wellington scale?—No; the salaries that I quoted are those actually paid by the Wellington Board.

715. But are they according to the Board's scale?—Yes, the scales that were in operation when the different teachers were appointed.

716. They are not paid according to the present scale?—Not all of them.

717. Take, for instance, the Hutt: the average attendance is shown as 202, and the salary paid £295?—Yes.

718. According to the Board's scale the maximum salary for any school—no matter how large—is £305?—Yes.

719. Then, is the salary paid in the case of the Hutt School according to the present scale?—No, not the present scale.

The Chairman: I think there is a greater difference than £10 between the salary of the schoolmaster at the Hutt and the maximum payable under the Board's scale.

720. *Mr. Davidson.*] Would a master receiving the maximum salary of £305 under the Board's scale receive house allowance in addition?—Yes.

721. So that instead of the difference being £10 it might be £60?—Yes.

722. Have you compared the salaries paid to the masters at the schools mentioned by you with the salaries paid in other districts to masters of schools of a similar grade?—In some cases.

723. Have you found that in any district in New Zealand the salaries for that grade of school are as high as those paid in Wellington?—Not as far as I have examined.

724. The salaries paid in Otago, for instance, are supposed to be high?—In some cases.

725. Take the first school in your list; the average attendance is 160: under the Otago scale the salary for that school would be £235?—Yes.

726. The salary under the alternative scale is higher than that paid in Otago?—Yes.

727. Take the next school; the attendance is 228; the salary paid in Otago to the master of such a school would be about £252, while under the alternative scale it would be from £252 to £262?—Yes.

728. In that instance, also, the alternative scale is higher than the Otago scale?—Yes.

729. The salary under the alternative scale for that grade of school is higher than that paid in any district in New Zealand except Wellington?—I am not able to answer that.

730. Suppose that provision were made under a scale suggested by this Commission, whereby the present masters of the schools referred to would not suffer so long as they held their positions, and at the same time the suggested scale for such schools were higher than that paid in any other part of New Zealand: would you approve of that?—I should rather approve of bringing the other districts up to the Wellington standard.

731. Do you think, then, that the other twelve districts in New Zealand are wrong in their scales of salaries, and that Wellington is right?—I should say that the Wellington Board is not paying salaries which are too high for those schools.

732. Have you compared the salaries suggested under the alternative scale for the class of school referred to with the salaries paid in the Australian States?—No, I have not any data to go upon.

733. Would you be surprised to learn that the salaries suggested under the alternative scale for that particular class of school are higher than those paid in any of the Australian Colonies, or any other district in New Zealand?—I do not know that I should be surprised.

734. Do you approve of the principle of a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes, a uniform colonial scale, with discretionary power on the part of the Boards for special cases.

735. Do you think that sufficient elasticity should be given in any scale to enable Boards to place teachers of either sex in certain positions?—Yes.

736. I think you said that you disapproved of the suggested certificates for the various classes of position?—Yes.

737. Take the first group, from 14 to 19; the certificate suggested is E5: do you approve of that?—Yes. Of course, if a person has had sufficient experience as a pupil-teacher it is possible for him or her to obtain a certificate without having had even twelve months' experience as a sole teacher.

738. Do you not think E2 somewhat high for the next grade?—Yes.

739. Would you suggest E3?—Yes, if the teachers at those schools have been pupil-teachers.

740. Take the next grade, 35 to 75: what is your opinion of the certificate suggested there —*i.e.*, D2?—It is too high.

741. Would D3 be more appropriate?—Yes.

742. You would insist on the letter D?—Not necessarily.

743. But you would prefer D3 to D2?—Yes, if D is insisted upon.

744. Do you not think the time has arrived when it would be quite possible to get teachers holding a D certificate—and a D3 for that matter—for that class of school?—Yes, possibly.

745. Then, with regard to the next grade: is D1 too high a certificate, in your opinion?—I think an E certificated teacher with sufficient experience could very well manage a school of up to 150 in average attendance—probably more.

746. Would you not suggest D2 instead of D1?—Yes, I should prefer it.

747. What is your opinion as to the certificate required for the next group of schools—250 to 600? You notice the headmaster is required to have a C1?—It is too high.

748. What would you suggest?—I consider efficient teachers of considerable experience quite capable of taking charge of the largest schools, especially old servants who have proved themselves efficient.

749. You think D1 a sufficient certificate for the master of any grade of primary school?—Under the conditions I have mentioned.

750. The first assistant at schools of above 600 is, according to the suggested scale, required to hold a B2 certificate: is not that too high?—It is certainly too high.

751. Do you approve of fines for not holding the required certificates?—A teacher should not be penalised, especially an old and efficient teacher.

752. Have you noticed the number of schools in the Wellington District having an average attendance of under 20?—No, I do not know the number.

753. There are forty according to the return I have here. What is the salary paid to the teacher of a school of between 15 and 20, according to the Wellington scale?—The maximum amount is £70.

754. Do you think that a fair salary to pay for that class of school?—It depends upon the position in which the teacher is placed; if he were placed near a centre it would not be so difficult to manage on that salary, but if he were placed back in the bush where he had to pay dearly for everything, including lodging, the salary would certainly not be enough.

755. The teachers at these schools will receive very much higher rates of pay under the suggested scale: under the scale suggested by the Inspector-General the salaries vary from £80 to £100?—Yes.

756. Compared with the Wellington scale salary of £70?—Yes.

757. Do you not think the Commission would be justified in recommending such a scale as the alternative?—Yes. I think these country teachers need considerable attention and increase of salaries.

758. Take the grade of school with an average attendance of from 20 to 25: what is the salary at present paid under the Wellington Board's scale?—£80, according to the regulations.

759. What would it be under the suggested scale?—£120 to £130.

760. Do you believe in the salary being increased per unit of attendance?—Yes.

761. It would be a considerable increase, from £80 to £120 or £130, would it not?—Yes.

762. Then, a very large number of country teachers at the smaller schools would be materially benefited by the adoption of such a scheme as that suggested by the Inspector-General?—Yes, certainly.

763. With regard to intermediate-sized schools, you gave sixteen instances where the head-teacher would suffer a reduction?—In nearly every case.

764. Not a very great reduction in some cases?—No.

765. If the present occupants of the head-teacherships of these schools were protected—that is, if they would not suffer a reduction during their occupancy of the position—and if a large number of country teachers would be materially benefited by the adoption of such a scheme as the alternative, do you not think it would be wise to adopt such a scheme?—Certainly.

766. *Mr. Stewart.*] You say you come before us as the representative of a certain class of teachers—viz., the head-teachers of schools of from 100 to 300 in average attendance?—Yes.

767. Did you have a meeting?—Yes.

768. How many were present?—There was a very large attendance of teachers. They appointed a committee to draw up a report, and gave that committee the option of appointing one out of two of the teachers, and I was selected to represent the teachers referred to.

769. Then, really, you are representing the Institute?—Yes, I am representing the interests of the Institute.

770. Setting scales on one side for the moment and dealing purely with the abstract principle, are the teachers of Wellington in favour of a colonial scale?—I think so.

771. Now, take the two proposed scales: they both advance the schools in grades—*i.e.*, they pay more to a teacher at a school of 50 than one of 30 in average attendance, and so on: do you approve of that principle?—Certainly.

772. I think you have already said that you approve of increases by units?—Yes.

773. I would like you to look at these figures which I have taken from a return by the Wellington Board. Take the Te Aro School: what is the average attendance according to that return?—504.

774. And the salary of the headmaster?—£320.

775. What is the average of the Hutt School as shown there?—207.

776. And the salary paid to the headmaster?—£295.

777. By what number does the average attendance at the Te Aro School exceed that at the Hutt?—By 297.

778. Rather more than double the attendance at the Hutt?—Yes.

779. You will notice that I have worked out some figures, including the increase per unit for those 297 pupils: how much is that increase per head?—1s. 9d. per head.

780. Then, according to the Wellington scale, as far as actual payments are concerned, the increase per unit from the 207 at the Hutt School to the 504 at Te Aro is 1s. 9d. per head: now take the first proposed scale for a moment, take a school of the size of the Hutt School—one from 225 to 250 or 175 to 225—what is the increase per unit there?—8s.

781. Then, under the proposed scale there is an increase of 8s. a unit, whereas under the payment by the Wellington Board the increase is only 1s. 9d.?—Yes.

782. Do you not think that the proposed scale is very much fairer in the amount of increase per unit than the payment by the Wellington Board?—Certainly.

783. Do you think it is right that the master of a school more than double the size of the Hutt School should receive only £25 a year more remuneration?—Certainly not.

784. It is not just?—No.

785. How many different scales have you had in this district within the last ten or twelve years?—I could not answer that question.

786. How many scales have you had in the last five years?—As far as I know, only one.

787. You told us before that the discrepancies between the salaries paid in some cases and what they should be according to the Wellington scale was the result of there being a different scale in operation when the occupants of the positions were appointed?—As far as I know, that is so.

788. Then, you have some knowledge of a change of scale?—Yes, there have been changes.

789. More than one?—I think so.

790. More than two?—Yes.

791. More than three?—Possibly.

792. Then, are these different scales in operation at the same time?—Different appointments were made under different scales.

793. Do you not think that under such an arrangement gross anomalies and unfairnesses arise?—Yes.

794. Then, under the present system of paying teachers in the Wellington Education District gross anomalies and injustices exist?—Under certain conditions.

795. Glancing at the maximum salaries payable under the Wellington scale, do you think that sufficient inducement is offered to the best class of men to enter the profession?—No.

796. You think that the maximum salary for a teacher ought to be very much larger than it is?—Yes, for city headmasters or masters of similar-sized schools.

797. Take, for example, the Clyde Quay School: the average attendance is 713; what would be the approximate salary under the proposed scale?—£405, with house allowance.

798. That is a more adequate remuneration for the highest position in the service than is paid by the Wellington Board?—Yes.

799. The teachers at the smaller schools would be much benefited by the proposed scheme?—Yes.

800. The head-teachers at the middle class of schools, in consequence of the various scales prevailing, extending over a number of years, would in some cases suffer a reduction?—Yes.

801. In the third place, the headmasters at the chief schools—the positions which form the prizes to which you all aspire—would be much better remunerated under the proposed scale?—Yes; under the conditions I have mentioned.

802. Then, do you or do you not think that some such scale as this suggested scale would be an advantage to the Wellington teachers as a whole?—With the exception of those I have pointed out in my evidence.

803. But the teachers as a whole?—Not those in the class that I represent.

804. I am not asking about any particular class: would the Wellington teachers as a whole be benefited by such a scale?—I have not calculated, but judging from a glance I should say that possibly they might.

805. You cannot answer unreservedly that they would?—No; I have not made a calculation to see whether the increase in the salaries of the teachers at the larger and smaller schools would make up for the loss that would be sustained by the teachers at the schools which I named.

806. You have already admitted that in the class of schools where a loss would be sustained by the master under the proposed scale, in consequence of the varying scales in operation in the Wellington District, great injustices and anomalies have arisen: should not these anomalies be remedied?—It all depends upon the conditions upon which these masters were appointed. If a man has been appointed under a certain scale I do not see that he should be reduced because of a lower scale coming into operation.

807. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you understand that the colonial scale and the alternative scale are merely put in as evidence by Mr. Hogben—that they do not commit the Commission at all?—Yes.

808. And that the Commission may formulate a scale altogether different from those two scales?—Yes.

809. Do you think it would be in the interests of education generally that a colonial scale of staff and salaries should be introduced instead of the varying scales now in existence?—Yes.

810. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You said, I think, that the salaries of teachers ought, in your opinion, to be increased by units, not by grades?—Yes.

811. The increases are by grades under the Wellington Board's regulations, are they not?—Yes.

812. Is the Wellington system working satisfactorily?—I think so.

813. Then, why do you wish to alter it, in order to increase the salaries by units?—Because sometimes you might have to make a certain average for six months before you could get any increase.

814. By which system?—I mean the "grade" system. There is no stipulation that the average must last in order to get an increase by the "unit" method.

815. By "unit," do you consider that the salaries should be based on the previous year, half-year, or quarter?—It would depend upon circumstances: for instance, heavy rain coming on at dinner-time would considerably affect the attendance in the afternoon, and such attendance should not be counted: the working-average should be struck without taking days like that into consideration.

816. Do you consider the percentage of 50 for the working-average high enough?—If you take into consideration special circumstances, such as bad weather, a bazaar, or a picnic, &c., which very often interfere with the attendance at country schools.

817. Would you overcome that difficulty by raising the working-average percentage to, say, two-thirds or three-fourths?—You might do so; I would not like to say so.

818. Does the working-average benefit the schools of the size that you represent to an appreciable extent?—Not so very much.

819. If it were raised to two-thirds or three-fourths, would it?—It might; the great feature in connection with the attendance is this: that in schools of the size that I represent very often the attendance is materially affected by the circumstances I have mentioned.

820. With regard to pupil-teachers, do you consider that there are too many pupil-teachers employed in this district for the efficient working of the schools?—Yes.

821. Is there any probability of those pupil-teachers who are undergoing their apprenticeship just now finding appointments when their apprenticeship is over?—Not for many years to come.

822. Do the Wellington Board grant facilities for the transfer of teachers from one country district to another, or the promotion of teachers within the educational district?—I think so.

823. Could you give any example of transfer or exchange of head-teachers that has taken place?—Yes.

824. With or without the consent of the Committees?—With the consent of the Committees.

825. Do you find that system works satisfactorily, then?—It is very seldom made use of.

826. Do you approve of a differentiation in the work that might be expected from a country school, and that expected from a large, fully staffed town school?—Yes, certainly.

827. Would you give the teacher an alternative in selecting class-subjects?—Yes, optional subjects.

828. Do you consider that the suggested scale of staff and salaries makes sufficient provision for pupil-teachers' salaries?—In most cases, I think so.

829. With regard to the lodging-allowance, do you consider the amount set forth in the scale sufficient when a pupil-teacher has to reside away from home?—It depends on the district the pupil-teacher is sent to. At some places a pupil-teacher could not possibly live on £10 a year.

830. *Mr. Hill.*] You approve, I understand, of the principle of a colonial scale?—Yes.

831. Would the suggested scale make a great deal of difference to assistant teachers in the Wellington District? Do you think it would benefit them or not?—I think it would not benefit the head-assistants; the alternative scale would, as far as it goes. I have not any data for schools with an average of more than 330.

832. It has been stated here that under the suggested alternative scale the salaries would be raised to the standard of the highest scale in New Zealand: do you think the Wellington teachers would agree with that scale?—I should think so.

833. You will notice that under the suggested scale a certificate is required in the case of certain assistants and all principal teachers: do you think that is a good feature in any colonial scale?—No; I am opposed to the system of classification at present in force.

834. Do you know any profession outside of the teaching profession where a member of it is paid part of his salary on the diploma he holds?—No.

835. Does your Board pay part of the salary on account of a diploma?—Yes; part on the certificate and part on the attendance.

836. What are you judged by in your school-work: is it the diploma which you may hold or your skill that the Inspector judges you by?—By the results of the actual work.

837. Does that represent your skill as a teacher?—To a certain extent, taking special circumstances into consideration.

838. Do you think, if that is the case, it is advisable to pay on the diploma you hold?—To a certain extent.

839. In what way?—Under the Wellington scale so-much is paid on the certificate held, and so-much on the attendance.

840. Does it follow that a man is a better teacher because he has a D, or a C, or an A certificate?—No, certainly not.

841. What is it that a man is judged by in life—the diploma he holds or the success he achieves in the profession that he follows?—The success that he achieves in his profession.

842. What do you think he ought to be paid by?—He should be paid a minimum salary for his qualifications, and also for his length of service and experience.

843. Not upon his diploma?—No; at any rate, that should take a secondary place.

844. Has your association considered the question of placing small country schools—say, for example, those with an average attendance of less than 30—in charge of lady teachers?—Yes.

845. Do you think that lady teachers are competent to carry on such schools?—Yes.

846. Do you think they could carry them on as efficiently as men could?—It would depend on the efficiency of both; a good lady teacher would certainly be better than an inefficient man teacher.

847. Do you think it would be advisable to set apart such schools for the lady teachers?—Not exclusively.

848. You think that men should go to that class of school equally with women?—Yes; for experience in that class of school, if for nothing else.

849. A woman could do the work there equally well with a man?—Yes; on even terms.

850. Would you carry out the "even terms" in the matter of salary?—It would depend upon the position of the school—I mean with regard to being near lines of communication or near a city, &c. If a teacher is sent right back into the country districts he or she should get a good salary.

851. But I asked you whether a lady teacher at the class of school referred to should get the same salary as a man teacher at a school of the same class?—Yes.

852. You recognise, I suppose, that a woman can teach up to, say, Standard IV.?—Certainly: higher.

853. Up to the Fifth?—Yes.

854. The Sixth?—Yes.

855. Supposing that a woman is equally qualified with a man in the matter of certification, and that she can can do as efficient work in the standards, how would you pay her then?—Not as high as I would pay a man.

856. Why?—For several reasons. In the first place, women are not demanding equal pay with men. I have asked many of our lady teachers, and do not find that they are demanding equal pay. Secondly, if a woman were paid the same salary as a man, keener competition would ensue, which must, in the long-run result in the breakdown of the woman; hence it would be cruel to place her in such a position. Thirdly, it is generally conceded that men have greater responsibilities than women. Fourthly, statistics prove that men adopt the profession as a life-work to a much greater extent than women. Fifthly, higher salaries for men are more likely to attract suitable boys into the profession. Sixthly, men do not break down so often as women. Seventhly, few women can control upper boys or mixed classes. Eighthly, a woman could not well take the place of the headmaster during his temporary absence. My last reason is that women teachers could not become heads of large mixed schools: married men are demanded by parents.

857. You think that a woman can teach as efficiently as a man?—In many cases.

858. You know that women teach and have control of schools in the Old Country?—Yes; the girls' schools.

859. And that they do the same amount of work as the male teachers in the boys' schools?—Yes.

860. And maintain discipline effectively?—I would not like to say so.

861. You think that if a woman were placed in charge of the Sixth Standard at a school there would be a possibility of defective discipline in that class?—It would depend to a very large extent upon the headmaster.

862. But you pay him a special salary to assist in maintaining discipline, do you not?—Yes.

863. Is it not as important that you should put a woman to control the girls in the Sixth Standard as it is to have the boys controlled by a man?—I think that a man has more power over the pupils than a woman.

864. Have you ever seen a lady teacher in charge of the Sixth Standard at a school?—I have known of one, but have not seen her at work.

865. Have you ever noticed the respect that the boys have for a lady teacher?—Yes; boys generally have respect for a lady teacher.

866. Which do you think is the most effective discipline in a school—that of force or duty?—Duty.

867. If you had to select between the discipline of force and the discipline of duty in a school, which would you prefer?—The discipline of duty.

868. Supposing you find that the discipline of duty is the form of training which the women generally adopt, do you think it is advisable that it should be carried into the boys' schools, or the discipline of force?—I think there must be a mixture of both, in all probability.

869. If the discipline of duty is not effective, it follows that there must be the discipline of force? —If the one cannot be carried out the other must.

870. You think, then, that it is necessary to debar lady teachers from taking the higher standards in the schools because they cannot control the children?—I should not debar them, because there are exceptional lady teachers who can do the work.

871. Supposing that women are required to do exactly the same amount of work as men, do you think they ought to have the same pay?—I have already stated my reasons for thinking the other way.

872. Supposing there was a vacancy in a school for, say, a teacher to instruct a higher class, and the position was thrown open to both male and female teachers, the same salary being offered: under ordinary circumstances, which do you think would be likely to be appointed—a man or a woman?—I should imagine that probably a man would be appointed.

873. In a case of that kind those having the selection would say, "We must adopt our staffing to the needs of the school"?—Yes.

874. Where do you think a woman, under ordinary circumstances, would be likely to be placed at a large city school?—Probably in the third position.

875. Do you not think it would be to the advantage of the men if in ordinary competition women were paid the same salaries?—I do not see that it would.

876. *Mr. Smith.*] Do you think it would be beneficial to the women if they were paid the same salaries as men?—No; it would be financially, but I consider the physical strain would be excessive.

877. If men and women were paid the same salaries, would it not lead to the choice by Committees of men instead of women?—Yes.

878. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Has the allowance made to your Committee been sufficient to keep the grounds and school in proper order?—No.

879. Do you have to get up concerts to assist the Committee?—Yes.

880. Do you like that business?—I do not.

881. The Committee ought to have sufficient money allowed them to keep the grounds and school in proper order?—If possible.

882. But you would rather get up concerts than have part of your salary devoted to the purpose? You see, a capitation of so-much is allowed, and if more is to be given to the Committee to keep the grounds in order it will have to come off the teachers' salaries: would you rather get up concerts than have your salary reduced?—It would depend on the size of the reduction.

883. Has your Board appointed a Truancy Officer?—Yes.

884. Has that helped the attendance at the schools?—Yes, very considerably.

885. It has brought more children to the schools?—Yes.

886. Have you studied the Truancy Act?—Yes.

887. Do you think it might be amended in the way of increasing the distance up to which children should be forced to attend?—Yes; I think a child might well travel three miles on good roads.

888. And might attend more often during the week?—Yes, generally speaking.

889. *Mr. Weston.*] You said just now that you thought the teachers generally in the Wellington District were in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes. Under the different scales in New Zealand there are teachers doing equal work for unequal pay in the different districts, and, providing that a colonial scale would bring all up to the level of the highest-paid districts, and not reduce the class which I represent by much, we would be prepared to make a sacrifice in order to benefit the more poorly paid teachers in other districts, and those in charge of smaller schools in this district.

890. You said that you approved of a colonial scale, provided there was a discretionary power left to the Board in special cases: what do you mean by that?—There are in, I suppose, every Board's service teachers of exceptional ability, who, if a colonial scale were adopted, should certainly receive more than other teachers. Two teachers might be equally certificated, and yet one might be far more efficient than the other; because they are equally certificated it does not follow that they should be paid equally.

891. Can you tell me how these special cases could be provided for under a colonial scale?—Only by judging from their work.

892. Would you provide, then, that teachers of a standing above the rest should receive a bonus?—I do not believe in the bonus system.

893. Then, how would you provide for these special cases?—By special recommendation of the Inspector that the work of one teacher was worth more than the work of another teacher.

894. Therefore you think there should be a contingency allowance over and above a colonial scale which the various Education Boards could dispense in cases of special ability?—Ability and length of service.

895. As a matter of fact, then, you yourself do not approve of a hard-and-fast colonial scale? —No, I think not.

896. Is that the view of the Wellington teachers as a body?—As a body, we view the proposed colonial scale with favour.

897. With the modification that you have mentioned?—That is my own idea.

898. You said you did not approve of lowering certificates?—Yes.

899. If teachers are to hold certificates of competency, do you not think that, as age comes upon men, and as men's circumstances, habits, and manners change, it will be essential to reconsider a teacher's competency, and, if necessary, lower his certificate?—Not in any way.

900. Why do you not think so?—I look upon a certificate as a valuable prize gained in a man's vigorous days, and it should be his private and sole possession.

901. Provided a scheme were adopted under which teachers would be appointed and paid according to the certificates they held, would it not logically follow that as men's abilities deteriorate, so, in the interests of the school, their certificates would have to be revised, and, if necessary, lowered?—Certainly not. I do not believe in a man's certificate being lowered in any way; but if a man cannot carry out his duties efficiently in the class to which he is appointed, he might be appointed to another position at a lower salary, where his abilities would find sufficient scope.

902. Do you approve of teachers being appointed by the Boards of Education and Committees, as at present, or would you prefer the appointments to be made by the Boards of Education direct?—By the Boards direct.

903. Would you prefer appointments to be made by the General Government—that is, the Education Department—or by Boards of Education?—Boards of Education.

904. Then, you are not in favour of handing over the management of our present educational system to the General Government?—No.

905. Do you echo the sentiments of the teachers of Wellington on that point?—As far as I know, I do.

906. Are the pupil-teachers too heavily burdened, in your opinion?—Yes, I think so.

907. What method of instruction would you suggest for pupil-teachers—that is to say, literary and practical instruction?—I would suggest that there should be a probationer—not paid the same salary as a pupil-teacher—attached to each school of an average of, say, from 150 to 300, who should be free to go to any class in the school. This probationer could relieve the head-teacher when the latter was examining, and at the same time pick up a good deal of knowledge of school-management. He could also devote a certain amount of time each day to relieving the pupil-teachers in different parts of the school, and thus gradually get information, and by-and-by be appointed as a pupil-teacher.

908. What proportion of the day should be devoted by the pupil-teacher to teaching?—At present the pupil-teachers teach five hours a day, and I think four hours a day is quite sufficient.

909. Do you consider that the subjects which pupil-teachers have to take for their examinations are too numerous?—I do not think so.

910. Do you think that pupil-teachers' examinations have been too exacting?—Not as far as my experience goes.

911. What is the opinion of the Wellington teachers upon that subject?—As far as I know, that is their opinion.

912. Do you think that there are too many pupil-teachers at the various schools?—I think so; in several instances, at any rate.

913. Then, I take it from what you say that the children are not receiving due justice and consideration at the hands of the educational authorities?—They could be more efficiently taught if there were better assistance and more experienced teachers.

914. Then, would you advocate the employment of more assistant teachers, even though that might necessitate a reduction in the salaries of teachers all round in your district?—If not certificated teachers, I should advocate the employment of ex-pupil-teachers—those who have gone through their course.

915. You think the employment of ex-pupil-teachers would get over the difficulty which you have mentioned?—An ex-pupil-teacher would rise, say, from £50 to £70 or £80.

916. Is there any difficulty in this district in getting pupil-teachers?—No, except in getting male pupil-teachers.

917. Is there trouble there?—Yes; we can get scarcely any.

918. How do you think that difficulty could be got over?—By making the service more attractive.

919. In that way could that be brought about?—First of all, by fixing minimum and maximum salaries for teachers, and paying those teachers, say, after they become assistants, a fair salary, on which they could live and pay college fees, &c.

920. What, in your opinion, should be the minimum and maximum salaries that should be paid to certificated teachers in order to attract boys into the profession?—The salary of, say, a city master should run up to about £420, and the minimum be not less than from £380 to £400.

921. What should be the minimum and maximum salaries paid to country-school masters?—It would depend on the size of the school.

922. What should be the minimum salary paid to any country-school master?—The masters at the smallest schools could not expect to get a very high salary.

923. I will put the question in another way: what should be the minimum salaries paid to all certificated teachers?—That would depend upon the experience that the teacher had had. It is possible for a girl to go to a high school or college, matriculate there, and in the course of one or two years to get, say, a D certificate. With an experience of only two years that teacher should not obtain the same class of position or the same salary as a teacher of longer experience. It is possible now for a teacher with that limited experience to get the same salary as a teacher with from fifteen to twenty years' experience.

924. With reference to sick-pay and compassionate allowances in case of death, what is the opinion of the school-teachers in this district on those two subjects?—As far as sick-pay is concerned, we approve of the Board's allowances—*i.e.*, they allow full salary for one month, and after that take the circumstances into consideration as far as possible. As far as compassionate allowances are concerned, we have not given the subject any consideration; but we have always found that the Board has dealt liberally and satisfactorily with the teachers concerned.

925. *Mr. Hogben.*] Have you a copy of the Wellington Board's scale?—Yes.

926. Take the Featherston School: you gave us the average attendance as 145; the certificate of the teacher, I see, is D1—what would be the salary according to the Wellington scale?—£255 is the amount stated in this Table 8.

927. That is the amount actually paid: what would the salary of the teacher be according to the Wellington scale?—£235.

928. Then, he is paid £20 more than the scale provides for?—Yes.

929. According to the alternative scale he would be paid £235, so there would be no loss there—I mean the salary under the alternative scale would be as high as that under the Wellington Board's scale: is that not so?—£235 would be the amount that he would get under the alternative scale.

930. Then, he would receive as high a salary under the alternative scale as under the Wellington Board's scale?—Yes.

931. Take Roseneath: the average attendance is 105—what would be the salary of that teacher (who holds a B1 certificate, I see) under the Wellington scale?—£245.

932. Now take Kaiwarra: the average attendance is stated as 106, and the teacher has a C1 certificate—his salary would be £245 according to the Wellington scale?—Yes.

933. He is getting £290—£260 salary, and £30 house allowance: his salary is not in accordance with the Wellington scale, is it?—No.

934. The master at Kaiwarra gets a larger salary than he would receive if paid according to the Wellington scale?—Yes.

935. Take the Eketahuna School: the average attendance is 112; there are four more pupils than at the Kaiwarra School, but the salary paid falls back to £245—£15 less?—Yes.

936. Now take Levin: the average attendance is 125, and the salary paid £235—£10 less than that paid to the master at the Eketahuna School; the attendance is larger by 15, but the salary £10 lower?—Yes, that is so.

937. At the Brooklyn Scool the average attendance is 180, and the salary paid £255?—Yes.

938. Take the Hutt School: the average attendance is 202—what would be the salary of the master according to the Wellington scale?—£275.

939. And he is getting £295?—Yes.

940. £20 above the scale?—Yes.

941. Now take the Carterton School: the average attendance is stated as 280—78 more pupils than at the Hutt School—what would the salary be for the headmaster according to the Wellington scale?—£275.

942. So that for 78 more pupils the master at the Carterton School would get no increase under the Wellington scale?—That is so.

943. What amount of the salary (£275) of the master at the Carterton School depends on the certificate?—£165 for a D1 certificate.

944. And £110 depends on the average attendance, does it not?—Yes.

945. Supposing that the master of the Carterton School held a C1 certificate, what would his salary be under the Wellington scale?—£10 more—£285.

946. Then, he is fined £10 for not holding a C1 certificate?—Yes, practically.

947. The difference, under the Wellington scale, between the highest and lowest amounts dependent on certificates is £40, is it not—£175 and £135?—Yes.

948. So that a teacher might be fined as much as £40 a year on account of certificate, according to the Wellington scale?—Yes.

949. Would it be possible for a teacher to be fined as much as that under the scale which I have submitted?—I cannot answer that.

950. Have you considered what principle a scale should be based upon if the total amount available for the payment of the salaries is paid on the capitation basis? On what principle should the salaries of head-teachers and others be principally based?—Upon length and efficiency of service.

951. Could you draw up a workable scale on that basis?—I have not tried.

952. Do you mean that you think a scale should be drawn up on the basis of length and efficiency of service without relation to the size of the schools?—No; but that should be probably the first consideration.

953. Is that considered when the capitation grant is made?—I am not aware of that.

954. If a scheme of staff and salaries is based on the length and efficiency of service of the teachers, and the payment to the Boards is based on the average attendance, is it not inevitable that sooner or later such a scheme must break down financially?—Yes; but I should base it on three things—first, length and efficiency of service; second, average attendance; and, third, the certificate held.

955. If the Boards are paid on average attendance, how can they pay except on average attendance unless their scales break down?—Yes, I can see that.

956. Well, then, a Board is likely to be placed in difficulties if, in the first place, it does not pay according to its own scale; and, in the second place, if its scale is not founded principally on average attendance instead of being allowed to depend chiefly on something else?—That is so.

957. In your opinion, if the grants are paid on average attendance the scale must be founded principally on average attendance?—I would not say that the scale should be based on average attendance altogether.

958. Supposing the salary of a headmaster had to be based on length of service and efficiency, would not that imply, to prevent such a scale breaking down, a system of promotion, so that when a teacher's experience and length of service were such as to make him, so to speak, too good for a certain school he should be transferred to another school?—Yes, that is so.

959. There would have to be a system of transfer and promotion?—Yes.

960. Do you think it possible to draw up a colonial scale founded on experience and efficiency without providing for colonial promotion?—They must go together to some extent.

961. For instance, would it be possible to have such a complete system of promotion in the Wellington District? Take the sixteen schools that you represent: are there any other places for the teachers at these schools to go to if the attendance at their schools falls—I mean within the Wellington District?—Of course, they would have to wait till vacancies did occur.

962. And meantime the Board would be losing?—Yes, if it kept them up to the same salaries.

963. In fact, an area larger than the Wellington District would be required in order to provide such a system of promotion?—Yes, if promotion came when the average attendance went up, or when the increase of experience entitled a man to promotion.

964. Otherwise he would be paid a salary for which the Board would not be receiving the funds?—Just so.

965. Therefore, to make such a scheme financially sound, there ought to be a system of promotion, and it is not possible for Wellington to have such a system of promotion, because it is not large enough? Such a scheme would involve colonial promotion?—Yes.

966. And that would mean departmental appointment?—That is so.

967. There are various objections to a system of departmental appointment?—Yes.

968. For instance, the department could hardly be expected to know the exact fitness of a teacher for a position as well as the Board would know?—No, certainly not.

969. So that a scale such as the Wellington one, much as it may have to recommend it, requires a colonial system of promotion to make it financially sound, and yet there are very strong arguments against having a colonial system of promotion?—Yes.

970. Does not that suggest the expediency of reducing the Wellington scale?—Undoubtedly.

971. *The Chairman.*] I think you said that you have had a good experience of the nature of the work carried on in medium-sized schools?—Yes.

972. I would like to ask your opinion with regard to the work of a headmaster and his assistants: do you think there is any very great difference between the work of a headmaster at a school of about 300 and that of the first assistant master at the same school?—Yes, there is a great deal of difference. At such a school the headmaster must—under our Board, at any rate—be responsible for the teaching of the Sixth and Seventh Standards; he is therefore bound to his classes all day, unless by some arrangement he can get the first assistant to take such subjects as, say, singing, science, and history. If that can be done, the headmaster is free to get to the other parts of the school to aid the pupil-teachers and other assistants, if necessary, in their work. He is responsible for the planning of all the work, for the carrying-out of the instructions both of the Government and the Education Board; he has to train the pupil-teachers; he has to make periodical examinations, and thus leave his class for at least a month in the year. Besides all this, he is responsible to the Committee, the Board, and the parents of the children; and it is a very great responsibility. Whereas the assistant master usually has, say, Standard V.; probably he also takes the upper classes in singing, science, and history, and he is simply responsible for that one standard and the upper classes in connection with those subjects.

973. In schools of a larger size—say, from 400 to 500—the headmaster has still to take an active part in the work, especially of the higher standards, I presume?—No; under our Board a first assistant master is not appointed until the average attendance at a school reaches 461: that frees the headmaster from teaching a class himself. The headmaster is then free to arrange supervise, train the pupil-teachers, and very often take the classes of sick teachers, besides examining the school throughout, and being responsible for everything connected with the school; whereas the first assistant master is, in almost every case, bound to attend to probably only the Seventh Standard—he might have the Sixth and Seventh. When I was first assistant master I had the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Standards, but I do not think that appertains at all to Wellington schools at the present time. He has also the drill to look after, and, of course, the sports.

974. Do you know whether in any case the duty of instructing the pupil-teachers falls upon the assistant instead of the headmaster?—Yes; the first assistant masters at the city schools—or most of them—have the instruction of pupil-teachers in separate subjects on certain days in the week, and I know of one instance where the first assistant at a country school takes the pupil-teachers.

975. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are the assistant masters paid specially for that work in addition to their ordinary salaries?—Yes.

976. *The Chairman.*] In case the headmaster becomes disabled through accident or sickness, is the first assistant, as a rule, called on to perform his work? Is the assistant master competent to do it?—Yes, if he has had sufficient experience. At present it is quite possible for a man with limited experience to get into a good position on account of his holding a high certificate.

977. Is it expected of the first assistant that he will be able to perform the work of the headmaster when a necessity of the kind arises?—I think so, in the large schools.

978. I suppose he is like the first officer on a vessel—he must at times take the captain's place?—He must be the headmaster's right-hand man.

979. In a case of that kind, seeing that the work of the first assistant is so important, what do you think should be the difference between the salaries of the headmaster and the first assistant?—There should be a difference of at least £100.

980. Could you say what percentage? Do you think the first assistant should have a salary of four-fifths of the salary of the headmaster, or three-fourths, or what relative proportion?—I could not say exactly.

981. If the headmaster received £400 a year, what would be an adequate salary for the first assistant?—I should say from £230 to £240 a year. If you make the first assistants' salaries really good ones the men who occupy those positions will stay in the towns; they will keep these

good positions, and the country will thus lose their services as country masters. Not only so, but the country masters will endeavour to become first assistants in town schools.

982. Has it not been the case for years that the country teachers are very anxious to become first assistants at the city schools?—If they have not had that experience before, yes.

983. Have you known of any anxiety on the part of assistants in the city schools to go out into the country?—In some cases, for increased salary, and also for increased experience.

984. What percentage of a difference in salary should there be between the first assistant and the second assistant?—If the first assistant gets £240, I should say that the second assistant ought to get at least £185.

985. Do you think that would be a sufficient difference?—Quite enough; the second assistant should get from £185 to £200.

986. I think you said that in your opinion pupil-teachers were not receiving sufficient remuneration?—I referred to boys not being attracted into the service, possibly on account of the small salaries offered, because they can get better salaries in other callings.

987. Would you recommend a difference being made between the salary paid to a male pupil-teacher and that paid to a female pupil-teacher?—Yes, certainly.

988. What do you think would be a reasonable difference?—I think the difference in the salaries paid by the Wellington Board is giving satisfaction; or the difference between the salaries under the proposed scale would be reasonable.

989. Do you know whether the salary paid to pupil-teachers under the Wellington Board's scale is attracting male pupil-teachers?—No, it is not just now.

990. Would you recommend that the salaries of both male and female pupil-teachers be increased?—Certainly.

991. You are opposed to similar salaries being paid to males and females in the teaching profession?—I said that in the small country schools their salaries might be even.

992. What do you think would be an adequate salary for teachers in the smallest country schools?—That would be according to circumstances. If the school is within easy reach of the city, probably within reach of the teacher's home, the salary would not be expected to be so high as that paid to the teacher of a school situated twenty or thirty miles from a main road, where probably the teacher must pay £1 a week for board and put up with the best he or she can get, which is not always luxury.

993. Then, what ought to be a minimum salary for teachers of that class of school?—It would depend on the experience and the certificate of the teacher. If you sent a fifth-year pupil-teacher who has just obtained, say, his or her E certificate to a school like that in the back blocks, he or she could not expect the same salary as one who had served, say, five or ten years at teaching. There should be a difference in that way.

994. Do you think there is a large difference between the competence of the two classes of teachers you have referred to, the experienced and the inexperienced?—There should be.

995. Do you think it would be fair to send one teacher, paid a small salary, and comparatively inexperienced, to teach at one school, and then send to another similar sized school an experienced teacher with a much higher salary: do you think that would be fair to the children?—No. I consider that those country schools require special attention; they should have the very best teachers obtainable at the salaries.

996. Do you think £80 a year a fair remuneration for the teachers at the class of school I have been referring to?—I think that from £90 to £100 is as little as a teacher can really do anything on. Of course, I would go up higher than that in cases of long experience and higher certificates.

997. Do you think that a teacher in the country with between 30 and 40 children to teach without assistance should receive the same salary as a first assistant in one of the large schools?—I think not.

998. Which do you think has the more arduous and responsible duties to perform?—The teacher in the country has the more arduous work, but he or she would take a school of that kind only as a stepping-stone to something better; you would not expect a person to take a school such as that if he or she could get anything higher.

999. Do you think it is advantageous to the country schools that they should be used in this way as stepping-stones?—Certainly.

1000. Teachers should not look upon them as permanent positions, but simply as a means of getting better positions?—Yes, for this reason: that in order to be a thoroughly all-round teacher a person must have experience in all kinds of schools and in all standards. That in my experience.

1001. Do you consider that principle should be applied to the larger schools? Do you think the teachers at the larger schools should be more permanent than those at the small schools?—If possible; but the schools here are simply training-grounds for future head-teachers; as soon as a teacher has obtained sufficient experience in one of the standards he looks for something higher.

1002. They all aim at the head?—Yes.

1003. I think, from what you have stated already, that you consider the profession as a whole is underpaid at the present time?—In some cases, and especially in some districts.

1004. The Wellington District?—I have not said so; I said that we preferred the Wellington scale to either the suggested scale or the alternative.

1005. Do you think the headmasters at the city schools are fairly paid for the work they do?—I think each one is worth £400 a year, as he is at the top of the tree.

1006. Do you think the first assistants are adequately paid—most of them receive £220 a year?—I think they should not have less than £230, and should go up to £240.

1007. If the salaries were increased do you think it would lead to an improvement, either in the capabilities of the teachers or the quality of the education imparted?—I do not think so; I do not think the salary would make any difference whatever to an honourable man.

1008. Do you know from your own experience and knowledge whether, when vacancies arise in big city schools, there is any difficulty in getting suitable applicants to come forward?—No, not generally speaking; but applications for such positions as the first-assistantships are frequently put in merely for the purpose of getting the applicant's name before the Board for promotion—not that he expects to get the position which he is applying for.

1009. Do you know whether it is the case that, when vacancies of headmasterships have occurred in the Wellington District, applications pour in from the most competent headmasters in New Zealand?—I am quite aware of that; there are very few large schools that one can get in any part of New Zealand.

1010. Seeing there is such a scramble as that for headmasterships, do you think it is an indication that headmasters are not adequately paid?—It indicates that the applicants are probably getting smaller salaries than that attached to the position which they are applying for. They simply wish to better themselves.

1011. But do you not think that if the salaries paid to headmasters were insufficient the Board would occasionally find a difficulty in getting competent men to fill the positions?—I do not think so. I do not say that the salaries paid to headmasters are either meagre or poor.

1012. Then, why do you wish to improve them? Why are they inadequate?—I do not say they are inadequate.

1013. You said that £400 should be paid to the headmasters at the city schools, instead of £370: what proof is there that the smaller salary is not enough?—The headmastership of a city school is the highest position in the teaching profession, as far as teachers in active service in New Zealand are concerned, and the position is certainly worthy of that salary, because the men occupying such a position must have taught for very many years; he must be a skilful man, a good manager, and an excellent disciplinarian; and we should pay for ability and length of service as they deserve.

1014. What I wanted to get at was this: whether there is any indication whatever that £370 a year is not a sufficient salary to induce the best teaching talent in New Zealand to apply for a position?—I would not say so.

1015. But you think £400 is required?—I do not know about being required. I think that in such a profession, which is regarded probably as one of the best of the public services in New Zealand, there should be something worth aiming at.

1016. Why fix £400; why not go up to £450 or £500?—If circumstances and means would allow, I should put it up to £1,000. I heard lately of quite a young man getting £500 a year in an insurance office, and I think teachers do far more important work than insurance.

Miss Myers, B.A., First Assistant at Roseneath School, examined.

Miss Myers: I do not wish to make a statement, but only to answer any questions that may be put to me.

1017. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is the average attendance at the Roseneath School?—From 120 to 130, I think.

1018. You occupy the position of infant mistress?—I am called "first assistant," but have charge of the infant department.

1019. What is your present salary?—£80 a year.

1020. What would it be under the suggested alternative scale?—About £110, I think.

1021. In that respect you consider the alternative scale much more satisfactory than the Wellington scale?—Yes.

1022. How long have you been teaching?—I have been in the Board's service eight years, and have had experience in a private school.

1023. What is your certificate?—B2.

1024. You hold a university degree?—Yes.

1025. In the light of your experience as a teacher, if you had your time to go over again would you enter the service of the Education Board?—Not unless there were some prizes offered.

1026. You think that the present rate of salary for positions similar to that occupied by you is altogether too low?—Yes.

1027. What is the staff at the Roseneath School?—A master and two assistant mistresses.

1028. Have you compared the two suggested scales of salaries, Nos. 1 and 2?—Yes, but not very carefully.

1029. You see that the No. 2 scale gives the title of "infant mistress" to the female assistant who teaches the infants?—Yes.

1030. Do you approve of that? Do you think it adds dignity to the position of the assistant to call her by that name?—I do not know.

1031. You are not very particular as to the name?—No.

1032. Probably you think the salary is much more important?—Yes.

1033. *Mr. Stewart.*] I suppose, Miss Myers, that you are acquainted with a good many teachers in the Wellington District?—Yes.

1034. Can you give the Commission any idea as to whether the lady teachers in the Wellington District are satisfied with the rates of payment that obtain here or not?—They are not satisfied.

1035. Have you made any comparisons, for example, between the salaries paid to lady teachers in Wellington and Otago?—Yes, some comparisons have been made.

1036. What was the result: was it in favour of the Wellington lady teachers or the Otago lady teachers?—The Otago ones, I believe.

1037. Taking the lady teachers as a whole, do they wish for a colonial scale or that the present state of affairs should continue?—It is hard to speak for others.

1038. Do you not represent the lady teachers in any way?—No.

1039. What is your own feeling in the matter?—I think a colonial scale would be better than the present state of affairs.

1040. Have you any idea as to what extent the proposed scale would benefit the women teachers of the colony?—No; I have not gone into it.

1041. Would you be surprised to learn that the proposed scale would benefit the women teachers of the colony by from 12 to 20 per cent.?—We should like to see more openings made for capable women.

1042. Do you not think that this scale would make a great many more openings?—It would make more, but I do not think they are sufficient.

1043. In what direction would you like to see openings made for women?—That, where possible, girls should be taught entirely by women.

1044. Do you believe in the separation of the sexes in the schools?—Where possible.

1045. Have you had any experience in that connection?—Not personally.

1046. Are you aware that the tendency amongst educationalists is quite in the opposite direction?—No; I thought that of late years it had been in the other direction.

1047. We may take it, I suppose, from the general bearing of your evidence, that you, and as far as you know, others, are in favour of a colonial scale of payment?—Yes.

1048. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long have you been at the Roseneath School?—Three years.

1049. How long is it since you obtained a University degree?—Ten years.

1050. Have you applied for other positions under the Wellington Board?—Yes.

1051. Does the Wellington Board, then, not give sufficient facilities to its own teachers to gain promotion when they deserve it—for example, have teachers from other districts been appointed to some of the positions for which you have applied?—Some that I have applied for have been given to men.

1052. Were they principally applications to take charge of schools?—Yes.

1053. Would such a staff as that set down in the proposed scale be sufficient at a school such as yours—*i.e.*, two pupil-teachers instead of an assistant?—It would mean that the Roseneath School would have to be divided into two parts.

1054. The proposed staff would not suit the building?—No.

1055. There are other schools in this district of much the same size as yours?—Yes.

1056. Do you consider that the staff you have could work the school better than a staff that did not suit the school-building so well?—Ours is rather unusual: we have an assistant instead of two pupil-teachers, because that staff suits the school better.

1057. Do you consider it is better to have an assistant, where practicable, instead of two pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1058. And that there are too many pupil-teachers in the employment of the Board?—Yes.

1059. Have you been a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

1060. Do you think the remuneration paid to pupil-teachers by the Wellington Board sufficient?—I do not think so; but the rate of payment has been altered since I was a pupil-teacher.

1061. Do you think that the salaries for pupil-teachers set forth in the proposed scale are adequate?—No.

1062. Do you consider that male and female pupil-teachers should receive the same pay?—Yes.

1063. And male and female head-teachers, up to a certain limit?—Yes, up to a certain limit.

1064. Have you been sole mistress of a country school?—No.

1065. You could not say how many you could teach unaided in a country school?—No.

1066. Which standards do you teach at the Roseneath School?—All the infants, and the First Standard. I have also charge of the sewing.

1067. Do you consider that female teachers can teach the standards up to and including the Fourth as efficiently as male teachers?—Yes.

1068. And they should receive the same remuneration up to, say, a living wage—£100 a year?—Yes.

1069. Do you favour equal pay for equal work to males and females?—Up to a certain point.

1070. What do you consider a sufficient differentiation between the salaries paid to males and females? Do you think 10 per cent. sufficient?—No, I think there should be a little more than that; but I have not given the subject much consideration.

1071. Then, with regard to bonuses on teachers' certificates, do you favour the adoption of the principle of granting bonuses on the certificates teachers may hold?—I think the salary should include everything.

1072. If you do not favour bonuses, you do not favour reductions or fines for those who do not hold minimum certificates?—No.

1073. Do the Wellington Board pay the teachers directly, or through the Committees?—Directly.

1074. Do you favour that system?—Yes.

1075. With regard to the syllabus, do you consider that it would be equitable to make a distinction between the work expected from a large town school and that expected from a small country school?—I know nothing of the working of country schools, but I should think that more might be expected from a large, fully-staffed town school than from a country school.

1076. *Mr. Hill.*] Did I understand you to say that you had had experience at a private school?—Yes.

1077. Was that before or after you served as a pupil-teacher?—After.

1078. Where were you trained as a pupil-teacher?—In Wellington.

1079. You obtained your diploma after you had finished your pupil-teachership?—Yes.

1080. You think that girls' schools should be fostered: have you any special reason for this?—I think it would be beneficial to the girls themselves.

1081. Do you think it a disadvantage to have mixed classes for the senior pupils?—Yes, I think so.

1082. Have you had any experience of mixed schools,—say among the senior classes?—Yes.

1083. Have you found the mixing of the sexes a disadvantage in the matter of instruction—I am assuming good supervision, of course: do you think the moral influences are not good?—Sometimes they are not; it depends.

1084. On what?—Largely upon the surroundings of the school.

1085. Do you not think when the boys and girls are working side by side it is an incentive to the one sex to emulate the other?—I think they work just as well when separated; they do in the high schools.

1086. But they also work together in the high schools?—They are usually separated, I think.

1087. It is a question of cost. Take the case of a large school: do you not think a large school could be carried on more economically by merging the sexes?—Yes; that is the reason why the sexes are not, as a rule, separated.

1088. Is it a question of salary—that the lady teachers should get the same salaries as male assistants at the large schools?—Not only that, but they would be given more scope.

1089. How many years have you been teaching?—Eight years in the public schools.

1090. How much of your present salary is paid on your certificate?—None.

1091. The Board does not pay lady assistants on their certificates?—No.

1092. Have you applied for promotion?—Yes.

1093. You think your present salary very small?—Yes.

1094. *Mr. Smith.*] Were you ever on the West Coast?—Yes, as a pupil of the Hokitika School.

1095. The Hokitika School is a mixed one, is it not?—Yes.

1696. Do you think there was anything of an undesirable nature in the way in which that school was carried on?—No. It is so long ago that I have forgotten.

1097. *Mr. Weston.*] I think you were trained at Canterbury College?—Yes.

1098. You are a B.A.?—Yes.

1099. What would be the advantages of a colonial scale?—The rates of pay and the staffing would be more uniform.

1100. If the teachers in the various districts were treated fairly by the Boards, do you not think that a colonial scale would not be required?—Yes, I think so.

1101. You have had the teaching of infants?—Yes.

1102. Have you made that your specialty?—No; I was placed in charge of infants without having had any previous experience of them.

1103. Do you not think that infant-teaching is a specialty?—Undoubtedly.

1104. I presume that in infant-teaching the mistress has to be very much in sympathy with the children, and to enter into all their little ways?—I should think that would be necessary in all teaching.

1105. But is it not more especially the case with infants?—Yes.

1106. Do you think that an infant class of, say, from 300 to 400 should be left to the tender mercies of one mistress, and the remainder pupil-teachers and probationers?—Considering that it is at that stage that the sparks of intelligence have to be watched for and gently fanned into a flame if their light is to illumine the whole life, I do not think that is wise.

1107. You do not think that children receive fair teaching by being left in the way I have just described?—No; I think they should have experienced teachers.

1108. Do you think that the whole of a pupil-teacher's time should be given to practical work in a school?—No.

1109. What is your idea, then, of the time pupil-teachers should teach?—I should think half their time would be quite enough, or, say, the mornings.

1110. Do you think, then, that the pupil-teachers in this district—and I may say that all we see in this district exists in other districts—are fairly treated?—They have far too much to do.

1111. Is there an undue tax imposed upon teachers in the instruction of their pupil-teachers?—It is all additional work.

1112. Do you think that the instruction of pupil-teachers should be divided between the teaching staff rather than left to the headmaster, or to an assistant under him?—In this district there is quite a different system.

1113. What is the method here?—The first assistants at the different schools take the pupil-teachers after school-hours.

1114. Do you think that lady teachers are capable physically—I do not say mentally—of taking the higher standards?—Yes, I think so.

1115. You think that the work would not be too great a strain upon them?—No.

1116. Do you think there should be any appreciable difference between the salaries paid to ladies and those paid to men—I mean when they take those higher classes?—Personally, I am willing that there should be a difference.

1117. What percentage of difference do you think this Commission should establish?—I have not gone into the matter.

1118. Do you think that pupil-teachers are paid sufficiently?—No.

1119. Why do you think they are not paid sufficiently?—Here they are expected to do the work of assistants, and pursue their studies at the same time.

1120. Assuming that pupil-teachers worked only half-time, do you think the pay would still be insufficient?—No; if they were working only half-time they should not be paid at full rates.

1121. Do you think that the payment to pupil-teachers should be higher than the payment that is usually given to, say, apprentices to various trades?—Considering that pupil-teachers have more important work to do, I think their allowance should be larger.

1122. Have we not a right to assume that the pay should be governed by the importance of the business?—Yes.

1123. Then, if that be so, you would naturally suppose that teachers would receive higher remuneration than the generality of mechanics?—Yes, certainly.

1124. Then, why should you make the payment to pupil-teachers higher proportionately than is given to apprentices to trades?—I did not know that that was so.

1125. You stated just now, I think, that women had no prizes in view?—Yes.

1126. Why do you say so?—There are no positions open to them.

1127. There are the positions of infant mistress at large schools, and, then, are there not first assistant mistresses?—Those positions are not very great prizes.

1128. Then, why is there always a sufficiency of female pupil-teachers?—I suppose there always will be; but as time goes on, and more professions are opened to women, the girls that you would like to get into the teaching profession will go into other professions, and those from a different class will come forward.

1129. Are you sure that young ladies of other walks of life—say, shorthand-writers and typewriters—receive higher pay than the young ladies in our schools at this moment?—Some of them do, I know.

1130. Are you able to speak generally?—Yes; I think it is so generally.

1131. *The Chairman.*] Have you had any experience at teaching the standards?—Yes, I have taught the Fourth Standard.

1132. At one of the large schools in the city?—Yes.

1133. Do you consider the salaries paid to the lady teachers of those standards sufficient?—No.

1134. What prospect has a lady teacher at one of the large city schools, in charge of, say, the Third or Fourth Standard, of getting her salary increased from year to year?—None whatever, so far as I know.

1135. Do you know of any lady teachers here who have been teaching standards for a number of years who are still enjoying the same salaries that they did a considerable time ago?—Yes.

1136. What is about the amount paid to female assistants of the class I have referred to?—I think £90 is the highest.

1137. What do the assistant masters receive for doing precisely the same work?—I think the lowest that is paid to an assistant master is £100.

1138. What other salaries are paid to the assistant masters?—I think the next is £150, but I am not sure about that. Then, the first assistants get £210 or £220.

1139. Do the female assistants or pupil-teachers have any opportunity of earning those salaries if they prove themselves to be highly capable?—No; I know of none that get those higher salaries.

1140. When you said that there are very few openings for female teachers, I suppose you meant that the only positions available for female teachers are those positions where, in your opinion, the salaries are low?—Excepting the position of infant mistress.

1141. £100 and under?—Yes.

1142. In your experience—which is considerable—have you known of any lady teacher being appointed to a position in a large school with a salary of, say, £150?—No.

1143. What you complain of is that there is no promotion and no improvement in salary for the female assistants and lady teachers such as there is for males?—Yes; there is provision made for the infant mistress, but she is an exception.

1144. The female assistants—standard teachers—invariably receive low salaries?—Yes.

1145. Much lower than those paid to the male assistants?—Yes.

1146. Do you know whether the Education Board throws the good positions in the schools open to both sexes?—I do not know.

1147. You see the vacancies advertised?—The advertisements generally say "first male assistant," and so on.

1148. So that the female teachers have no opportunity of improving their positions?—When, in an advertisement, sex is not mentioned the position is generally given to a man.

1149. With regard to country schools, do you know of ladies being appointed to country schools where the salary is over £100?—I have seen some advertisements for lady teachers at salaries of over £100, but only occasionally.

1150. Can you say whether such advertisements have appeared frequently, or very rarely?—I have not noticed particularly.

MONDAY, 24TH JUNE, 1901.

MISS CRAIG, Infant Mistress, Rintoul Street School, examined.

Miss Craig: Like a former speaker, I think it would have been a good thing had there been one or two ladies on the Commission, so that matters might have been viewed from a woman's standpoint as well as from a man's. I may say at the outset that I entirely agree with a colonial scale of staff and salaries, the greatest difficulty in the matter, to my mind, being that which crops up with regard to the house allowance to head-teachers. Of the two schemes that have been submitted for our criticism I prefer the alternative scheme, because I think it is better for country teachers and infant mistresses. I think the weakest point in the scheme, so far as I am able to judge, is that it proposes to reduce the salaries of assistant masters. This would come very severely

on the second assistants of our city schools. I do not think that these men are overpaid, and I think it would be an injustice to them to decrease their salaries. I think that, notwithstanding the difficulties in the way, it would do advisable to introduce a pension scheme. For various reasons, the women in this district have decided not to ask for equal salaries to those paid to men, even where equal work is being done; but we do think that the salaries paid to us ought to bear a fair proportion to those paid to the men. That the salaries paid to women in our profession are inadequate will, I think, surely be admitted when I say that the highest-paid woman at any of our schools in New Zealand does not receive anything like so good a salary as the salaries paid to the heads of some of our dressmaking establishments in this city. I believe that the highest salary paid to any woman at any of the public schools in New Zealand is something like £270 a year, but I know of women in dressmaking establishments who are getting £7 and £8 a week. With regard to pupil-teachers, I know of two girls who left the high school last year — both maticulated students: one entered the Civil Service and commenced work at £40 a year, while the other entered the teaching profession and commenced at £20 a year. The prospects of the girl who entered the Civil Service are much brighter than those of the girl who has adopted teaching. There are several schools in our district to which the scale does not apply. In these schools there are comparatively no infants, and for that reason we would suggest that an infant mistress be not appointed until the average attendance of the infants numbers something like 150; and then we think, when the attendance does reach that number, and an infant mistress is appointed, she should not be asked to do other work in the school, but that the infants' department be understood to be her work. We would also suggest that no separate infants' schools be established until there be an average attendance of at least 250. We cannot help observing that the chances of promotion for women in the colonies are very small compared with what they are in London. In London, where there are large separate girls' and infants' schools, there are many more positions open to women, and the salaries paid there are much larger than those paid here. We think that, as the purchasing-power of money is much greater there, the salaries paid here should be equal to those paid in London. Although I am specially representing the heads of infants' departments, I would like to say that I do not think the position of infant mistress should be the only good position in a school to which women can attain, but I maintain that it is almost the most important and responsible position in the school, and one for which considerable training and experience are necessary. We all know that in the erection of buildings the foundation-work is of the most importance—in fact, that the foundation-work cannot be overestimated; and I think that, if this be true with regard to buildings, it is infinitely more so with regard to the foundation-work of our schools. I think that where the foundation-work of a school is neglected, or where a bad foundation is laid, the whole after-work of the school suffers, and the work of the standard teacher is greatly increased. Not only is the infant mistress responsible for this foundation-work, but to her the young pupil-teachers are sent, and from her they receive their first training. When it is remembered that the infant mistress has to classify and examine, that she is responsible for the discipline and teaching of fully one-third of the school, and that the work has to be accomplished not only with inexperienced teachers, but often, so far as numbers are concerned, with a very inadequate staff, I think all will bear me out when I say that her position is both an arduous and a responsible one. In view of the fact, too, that kindergarten lessons—and, indeed, all foundation-work—require a great deal more supervision than upper-school work, and that infants require more individual attention than upper-school children, I think the staffing of infants' schools ought to be more liberal. I have seen—owing, I suppose, to inexperienced staffs—work in upper schools that reflected no great credit on our infants' departments, and this, I believe, owing to imperfect supervision of their early training. I think, because so much individual attention has to be given to infants, and because so much supervision is required in connection with kindergarten-work, that the staffing of the infants' schools should be much more liberal than it now is. There is another suggestion that I would like to make with regard to pupil-teachers. I think there should be some rule by which a pupil-teacher should be expected to spend part of her pupil-teachership in an infants' department, and the other part at standard-work I know of cases where newly-appointed teachers have been sent to an upper school and have had to remain there during the whole of their apprenticeship, and I know of other cases where pupil-teachers have been sent to an infants' department and have spent the whole of their pupil-teachership in that department. I think some arrangement should be made whereby pupil-teachers could have experience in both an infants' department and an upper school.

1151. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you served an apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

1152. What is your present position, Miss Craig?—I am the head of the infants' department at the Rintoul Street School.

1153. Have you ever taught at a small country school as sole teacher?—No; I have never been sole teacher at any school.

1154. What is your work at the Rintoul Street School?—I have charge of the infants' department and Standard I.

1155. What is the average attendance in the whole of your department, including Standard I.?—The number is 217. The attendance has greatly increased lately.

1156. What is the teaching staff in your department?—I am allowed five pupil-teachers or probationers; but for the past year I have been working with four.

1157. Do you think it would be an advantage to you to have a fully trained mistress to assist you instead of so many pupil-teachers?—There is no doubt of that. If there was at least one assistant who really understood the work, it would be a great advantage both to the children and myself.

1158. Have you noticed the suggested staffing under the alternative scale?—I have seen the alternative scale only so far as it applies to small country schools—not the extended one.

1159. Have you seen the first suggested scale?—Yes.

1160. The staffing provided in the first suggested scale is precisely similar to that in the alternative scale, with this exception, that there is one pupil-teacher less?—I do not think that it would make any very great difference to me, because it applies to the whole school—not specially to the infants' department.

1161. According to the Wellington Board's scale, there should be six adult teachers and seven pupil-teachers at such a school as yours; according to the suggested scale the staff would consist of eight adult teachers and five pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1162. If there were eight adult teachers instead of six at your school, the head-teacher would be enabled to place at the disposal of the infant mistress at least one fully qualified assistant: that would be a decided advantage, would it not?—Yes, I think so.

1163. What is your present salary?—£125 a year.

1164. That is the highest salary paid to a woman under the Wellington Board in a mixed school, is it not?—Yes, I think so.

1165. What salary would you receive under the proposed scale?—£160 a year.

1166. Then, in point of salary, the proposed scale would be a very great advantage indeed to women occupying similar positions to yours?—It would.

1167. You stated that there were not many openings for women in New Zealand as compared with London?—Yes.

1168. Do you think that a woman is capable of managing, as sole teacher, a school up to, say, an average of 40?—I should think so, decidedly.

1169. Do you know that in New Zealand there are at least a thousand of such schools?—What salary is paid?

1170. The salary under the alternative scale would range from £75 at an average attendance of 15 to £144 at 40; so that, if these thousand schools were thrown open to women, women would have a much larger number of opportunities for employment?—That would necessitate their going to the country; there would be very few town positions open to them.

1171. You admit that many of these schools would be somewhat near the towns?—Yes.

1172. Then, according to the alternative scale, an infant mistress appears at a school when the attendance reaches 41?—Yes.

1173. So that, at any rate, in the six hundred and odd schools above 40 in average attendance the positions of infant mistress would be kept solely for women?—I do not consider that the infant-mistress-ship of those schools is a very good position for a woman.

1174. You do admit that the salaries for women according to the suggested scale are a very great improvement on those paid throughout the colony at the present time?—Yes.

1175. Do you not think a position worth from, say, £120 to £180 a fairly good position?—I think it a fairly good position for the average woman, but I do not think it is anything very great for a very capable woman to look forward to.

1176. Can you compare the schools in London with the schools in New Zealand in this respect: do you know how many schools in New Zealand have an average attendance of over 500?—Very few.

1177. I suppose you admit that it would not be practicable to have three departments—*i.e.*, the girls', the boys', and the infants'—in schools having an attendance of under 500?—No, I do not think it would be possible.

1178. Then, you see that the conditions in New Zealand differ so greatly from the conditions in London that the same method of classification could not well be adopted?—Yes, I see that.

1179. You could not possibly have the special openings for women in New Zealand schools that they have in the London schools?—No.

1180. At any rate, in the 1,675 schools in New Zealand there would be at least 1,675 openings for employment for women?—I do not say that there are not positions for which women can apply. I say there are no very good openings, or very few specially good openings, for very capable women.

1181. You consider the position of infant mistress in a large mixed school an exceedingly important one?—Yes.

1182. You think that the salaries attached to that class of position should be really prizes for women?—I do. I think that women require special training and special experience before they can take such positions.

1183. Leaving out of consideration the thousand or more positions as sole teacher that would be open to women, and also leaving out of consideration those positions as infant mistress that are set apart specially for women, the majority of the assistantships are available for women, are they not?—I expect so; but, then, of course, the majority of teachers are women.

1184. I want to show that a very great many openings in the teaching profession are set aside specially for women, and that there are certain prizes, though not as many as you would like?—Yes.

1185. Is it a fact that the majority of assistants are women?—I think so.

1186. If under any scale exceptional women could occupy positions carrying a fair remuneration, that would mean prizes for women, would it not?—Yes.

1187. You consider, I understand, that provision should be made in any colonial scale for exceptional women occupying high positions on the staff of any school as assistants?—I do.

1188. *Mr. Stewart.*] I understood you to say that you thought the greatest blot on the proposed scale was that it would reduce the salaries of assistant masters?—I did, referring to the first scale.

1189. You have not heard the official statement of the Inspector-General that the salaries of assistants would not be reduced under the alternative scale, but would be increased in most cases?—I did not know that that was so.

1190. That meets your objection?—Yes.

1191. *Mr. Luke.*] I think you said that it was a pity there were not some ladies on this Commission: will you tell us why you think it a pity?—If there were one or two women on the Commission matters would be viewed more from a woman's standpoint, and it would have given greater confidence to many of the women giving evidence.

1192. You spoke about the foundation of education: did you refer solely to the infant classes, or the whole teaching of the primary schools? Do you not think the whole teaching of our primary schools is really a foundation of education?—Yes, only a foundation; but I referred specially to the work done in the infant department.

1193. You said that you did not ask that equal pay should be given to men and women for similar work: do you think the present disparity too great?—I think it is.

1194. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Whom do you represent, Miss Craig? The lady teachers?—Specially the mistresses of infant departments.

1195. Was a meeting held?—Yes; there have been several meetings of women teachers.

1196. How many were appointed representatives to give evidence before the Commission?—I was the only one, as far as I know; Miss Myers's name was added afterwards.

1197. With regard to pupil-teachers, do you think that the suggested scale provides adequate remuneration for pupil-teachers?—No. I think that, in the first place, a more careful selection of pupil-teachers should be made, and when the selection is made they should be paid better salaries than at present.

1198. Who do you think should make the selection of pupil-teachers—the Board, the headmaster, or the Committee?—I think that a Committee might be formed to make the selection, consisting of the Inspectors, headmasters, and some of the members of the Board. At one time the head-teachers had a good deal to say in the selection of pupil-teachers, and at that time I believe the selection was better than it usually is. I think there should be some standard of examination—an examination about equal to matriculation should be passed; then a candidate should be sent to a school as a probationer, and if he or she shows no evidence of ability at the end of the term of probation his or her services should be dispensed with. If, on the other hand, good reports are received from the teacher under whom the candidate is serving, he or she should be permanently appointed.

1199. You suggest that there should be an entrance examination for candidates for appointment as pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1200. The best to get the appointments?—Yes.

1201. Do you think there should be uniformity in teachers' examinations?—Yes, I think so.

1202. What provision would you suggest should be made for the training of pupil-teachers? Would you consider what you have advocated in your address sufficient—*i.e.*, removal from one school to another?—I think that pupil-teachers should receive their principal training at the hands of the teacher to whom they are intrusted, but I think there ought to be a training-college for them to go to after their pupil-teachership is over.

1203. Do you find that the pupil-teachers in the Wellington District are placed at a disadvantage through not having a training-college?—I should think that a training-college could not fail to be an advantage to teachers.

1204. Would you suggest the establishment of training-colleges in the four large centres of population—of course, there are two in existence already?—Yes, I think there should be such an institution at each of the four centres.

1205. Do you think there are too many pupil-teachers entering the service—*i.e.*, more than there is a probability of finding employment for after their apprenticeship is over?—Yes, I think there is no doubt of that.

1206. What would you suggest should be done to get over the difficulty? Would you advise their promotion to assistantships in the event of a colonial scale, such as the one suggested, coming into operation?—I think that where vacancies occur they should have the first chance, especially those who are at all capable.

1207. I think you said that you considered part of the twenty-five hours a week that pupil-teachers devote to teaching should be devoted to study?—Yes, where possible.

1208. How many hours a day would you suggest they should be engaged in actual teaching?—I think it would be better if they could be engaged half the day in actual teaching; the other half in study.

1209. I think you stated that you would support the substitution of an assistant for two pupil-teachers where practicable?—I did not say so, but I think it desirable.

1210. Have you found, from your experience in the Wellington District, that the school-buildings are suitable for making an alteration of that kind? Would it entail any considerable expenditure in adapting the school-buildings to the requirements—*i.e.*, separate class-rooms?—I do not think it would in the majority of cases; no doubt it would in some cases.

1211. In the suggested scale provision is made for the equal payment of male and female pupil-teachers: do you consider they should be paid equally?—Yes.

1212. What do you consider should be the minimum salary for male and female teachers respectively?—£100 a year for a woman and £110 for a man.

1213. You consider a differentiation of 10 per cent. sufficient in the lower salaries?—Yes, I think so.

1214. What would you consider a sufficient differentiation in the higher salaries?—A woman should receive a salary of 75 per cent. of that paid to a man when the work done is similar.

1215. The differentiation should be on a sliding scale according to the salary received?—Yes.

1216. With regard to certificates, do you consider that the minimum certificates set down in the suggested scale are too high?—I have not studied them specially with regard to country schools, but I do not think they are too high with reference to town schools.

1217. Would you approve of a proposal to impose a penalty or fine on those who do not hold the minimum certificate required?—I think it would be better if there were a teacher's certificate, all who held that certificate being eligible for any position.

1218. And not liable to any deduction?—No.

1219. You consider that the holding of a higher certificate would give a man or woman sufficient preference in obtaining an appointment?—Yes.

1220. Do you notice also a proposal in the suggested scheme for the deduction of £10 from the master's salary—in the case of small schools—when a sewing-mistress is appointed?—Yes.

1221. Do you think the lady teachers would be in favour of that?—I have not discussed that point with them; still, I do not think it should be so.

1222. What is your objection to the appointment of an infant mistress when the attendance at a school reaches 41?—I think she is not really an infant mistress then; besides teaching the infants, she has to take some standard work, so that she is not really an infant mistress.

1223. It is only the name that you take exception to?—Yes.

1224. With regard to superannuation, have the lady teachers in this district expressed any opinion with regard to retiring-allowance or superannuation?—No; but they consider that, if it were possible it would be a good thing to have something of the kind.

1225. With regard to the appointment of teachers, does the system in vogue work satisfactorily in this district, or do you think the Legislature should define the powers and functions of the School Committees and the Boards respecting the appointment of teachers better than it is defined at the present time?—I think the Board should appoint the teachers.

1226. You consider that the members of the Board have a better knowledge of the capabilities of the teachers?—I do not think it is the function of a Committee to appoint a teacher; the Committee may recommend, but I do not think it is their place to appoint.

1227. In the event of a colonial scale on something the same lines as the suggested scale coming into operation and prejudicially affecting a few individuals, would you suggest that it should not be retrospective, or, in other words, apply to those already holding positions?—I do not think that those at present holding appointments should be reduced. No reduction should, in my opinion, be made. And I think that all the really good appointments, where there are material increases in salary, should be advertised.

1228. Would the difficulty not be got over just as well if a proviso were made to the effect that no individuals should be prejudicially affected by the introduction of a colonial scale?—Yes.

1229. Do you think that the adoption of a colonial scale would in any way tend to weaken or minimise the power and influence of Education Boards?—I should not think so, because I understand that the salaries would be paid through the Boards just as at present, and that appointments would be made by them as at present.

1230. *Mr. Hill.*] I think you said that the lady teachers in the Wellington District are badly paid?—I think a great many of them are.

1231. Have you, as a ladies' association, ever drawn the attention of your Board to the fact?—We have not a ladies' association.

1232. I thought you represented that association?—No; the Educational Institute on behalf of infant mistresses.

Mr. Davidson: Might I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Educational Institute has frequently drawn the attention of the Minister to the fact.

1233. *Mr. Hill.*] I notice that the mistress at the Newtown School is classed E1, and she gets £125 a year. I also notice that the mistress at a similar school—Mount Cook Girls'—gets £150; at the Te Aro School the mistress, classed D1, gets £100; the mistress at the Terrace School, classed D1, gets £90; and so on: are those salaries according to the scale, or what is the reason for the differences?—In the Terrace School, I think, the first two assistants are masters, and the same applies to Willis Street (Te Aro) School; at the Newtown School the first three are masters, and the headmistress at that school, who gets £125, is infant mistress. At the Mount Cook Girls' School there are no infants, and it is the first assistant lady teacher who gets £150.

1234. I notice that at the Newtown School an assistant mistress, who is classed E1, comes low down on the list, and yet draws the same salary as you do: is there any reason for that?—All infant mistresses under the Board of Education are paid the same salary.

1235. Then, we can tell the infant mistresses by the fact that they get £125?—Yes.

1236. The infant mistress, then, is recognised as the principal lady assistant at the school—excepting the Mount Cook Girls' School?—There are other schools in the same position; at Willis Street, the Terrace, and Mount Cook Boys' Schools there are comparatively no infants.

1237. And at those schools the first lady assistant does not get £125 a year?—No.

1238. You are called the infant mistress at your school?—Yes.

1239. And are first lady assistant?—Yes.

1240. Would the other assistant mistress at your school be termed the second lady assistant?—Yes.

1241. Would it make any difference to you to be called the first lady assistant?—No; but I have given special attention to infant-work, and am better fitted for it than, say, Fifth or Sixth Standard work.

1242. Would your position in the school be altered by the change of title?—No; I have not the slightest fear of that.

1243. You think that in the training of pupil-teachers every female pupil-teacher should be required to go through an infants' department?—Yes, I think it advisable.

1244. How many pupil-teachers have you at present in your department?—I am supposed to have five, but at present have only four—one is away for some months on sick-leave.

1245. Do you ever have male pupil-teachers?—No; but I have known them to be sent to infants' schools.

1246. So that you cannot express an opinion as to whether they do the work in an infants' school as well as females?—I have seen them at work in an infants' school; but I think that, on the whole, girl pupil-teachers are better in the infants' department.

1247. A girl is better adapted to the training of infants?—Yes.

1248. Do you think boys should have no training in an infants' school?—I think it advisable to let them have a little time there.

1249. In order to have a complete training that training should always include some amount of work in the infants' department—that is, before these teachers are put to standard work?—I do not mind whether it is at the beginning or the end of their apprenticeship, but I think that during their apprenticeship there should be some time spent in an infants' department.

1250. I want to know as to the character of the training given to pupil-teachers in an infants' school. Assuming yourself to be the headmistress of a department and having responsible charge of the training of those pupil-teachers, would you merely put your pupil-teachers to do mechanical work, or would you explain to them the reasons why such a system, or such a plan, is pursued in the instruction of the children?—Yes, I think one should do the latter.

1251. You think that explanation, &c., should form an important part of the training of those pupil-teachers?—Yes, as far as possible.

1252. Is that done at your school?—As far as I have time to do it; but my staff is too limited for me to train them as well as I would like to do.

1253. You mean to say that your department is understaffed at the present time?—Yes.

1254. So that you are not enabled to give that training to these teachers that you would like to give?—No.

1255. Do you give criticism lessons at your school?—I give lessons to the pupils, and let the pupil-teachers listen. I also let the pupil-teachers give lessons, and point out the weak points to them afterwards.

1256. Do you think that the salaries paid to pupil-teachers are sufficient?—No. I think that the salaries ought to be higher.

1257. Would you bring the young people from the country schools for special training in the large schools, and would you send pupil-teachers from the town schools into the country during the course of their training, or would you specialise the training?—I think they should have an all-round training during their apprenticeship; they could specialise afterwards.

1258. Then, you would draw the pupil-teachers from the country with the view of giving them some special training in the larger town schools?—I think that if it were possible it would be a very good plan.

1259. And you would also send the pupil-teachers from the large town schools into the country if facilities could he provided?—Yes; but I think there would be more difficulty in that; the salaries are insufficient for them to pay their board in the country.

1260. But assuming that an allowance was made?—Many parents would object to young girls going away from home.

1261. There may be objections in that way, but if the department required it you think the plan would be beneficial?—I think it would.

1262. You approve of a colonial scale?—Yes.

1263. Why do you approve of a colonial scale? Supposing your Board could afford and cared to pay you the salary suggested in this proposed scale, would you still prefer a colonial scale?—Yes.

1264. Will you please explain why?—I think all teachers doing the same work should be paid the same salaries, and I think that if a colonial scale existed the teachers in the various districts would not be subject to reductions whenever the Boards got into financial difficulties. I think that if there were a colonial scale our salaries would be more assured, and it is only fair that those who are doing the same work should receive the same payment.

1265. You prefer the payment coming through the Government to its coming through the Education Board?—I understand that it would still come through the Board, but that the money would be ear-marked, as it were, so that it would have to be devoted to teachers' salaries.

1266. But supposing it were ear-marked in this way, that a certain proportion of the grant paid to an Education Board was required to be set apart for the payment of teachers' salaries, would you still prefer a colonial scale?—Yes; I think it would be better.

1267. Do you think a colonial scale of salaries should carry with it a colonial system of promotion from the lower to the higher schools?—No, though I do not see any reason why a teacher in one district should not have an opportunity of entering another district.

1268. But at the present time teachers have such opportunities, have they not?—Yes, I suppose they have.

1269. Supposing a colonial scale were introduced, do you not think there would be perhaps more competitors for a place than there are now?—I still think it would be better to have a colonial scale.

1270. Would you prefer to do without Education Boards altogether?—No.

1271. You think they are doing good work?—Yes; I think they are necessary in the various districts; I would not like to see them abolished.

1272. But you would like to limit their functions?—I would like to have a colonial scale.

1273. That would take away some of their functions?—Yes.

1274. Some of their powers should be taken away?—Yes.

1275. *Mr. Weston.*] You said just now, I think, that supposing a new scale were framed you would advertise afresh in cases where the salaries were increased?—Where the salaries were increased materially, not where they were increased by only a few pounds.

1276. Do you think that would be fair in its operation: would you not be turning out very good teachers on the chance of their being reappointed?—Not so long as it was provided that they should receive no appointment which was worse than the one at present held.

1277. Could a Board under the present system of appointment give any such guarantee to teachers?—I do not see why it could not.

1278. Do you not know that if teachers are exchanged, or when they are appointed, the Committees have to be consulted?—Yes.

1279. Then, how could a Board guarantee a position to a teacher when the Committee of a particular school had to be consulted?—It would be no worse than under the present system.

1280. I only asked you that question because I feared you had not thought out the matter. You were talking just now about sending pupil-teachers from school to school with a view to their acquiring experience: have you considered whether the Committees of the various schools, or, indeed, the parents of these pupil-teachers, would approve of such transmission?—The pupil-teachers have to go to whichever school they are appointed; they have no choice in the schools to which they shall go. If a pupil-teacher is appointed at one part of his or her pupil-teachership to an upper school he or she can have no objection to going to an infants' school during the other part.

1281. Is not a pupil-teacher appointed to a particular school?—Pupil-teachers have no choice in the matter.

1282. Is that so?—Yes; in Wellington.

1283. Do you think that if such an arrangement were made throughout the colony parents of pupil-teachers would approve of the arrangement?—They could decline the appointment.

1284. Do you not think that such an arbitrary arrangement as that would rather prevent good children, especially girls, coming forward as pupil-teachers?—I did not advocate town girls being sent to the country as pupil-teachers at first. I merely suggested, so that they might have a good all-round training, it would be advisable that part of the time should be spent in an upper school and part in an infants' school. As country teachers have infant-work to do they are frequently sent in from the country for a few days to city schools.

1285. In theory, I think, you are perfectly right, but could you put your theory into practice?—It is done here.

1286. With regard to employing pupil-teachers, do you consider that under your present method the best use of the school time is made in the interests of the children?—We do the very best that we possibly can, I think.

1287. If you had adult teachers rather than pupil-teachers, would better use be made of the time?—Yes, undoubtedly; a trained teacher would be better than a pupil-teacher.

1288. Therefore most is not made of the time under the present method?—It is so far as we have to do with the matter, but we are not responsible.

1289. Then, instruction by pupil-teachers is not so successful and so profitable as adult teaching?—Of course not.

1290. Do you think that pupil-teachers are able to impart instruction to young children?—I think a great deal depends on the pupil-teacher. I think that it is right to have some pupil-teachers' in the infants' department. Whilst the girls are young they have more sympathy with child nature.

1291. What proportion of adult teachers to pupil-teachers do you think should be employed?—I think that no more pupil-teachers should be appointed than there are likely to be positions for when their pupil-teachership is over.

1292. I mean with regard to infants' schools?—It depends on the size of the department, but I think that usually if there were a headmistress and one good trained teacher as an assistant the rest might be pupil-teachers—of course, not all first-year pupil-teachers.

1293. Would you make that answer general, or would you limit the number of children in regard to which such an arrangement would prove effective?—Thirty pupils ought to be the limit for each teacher in an infants' department.

1294. So that when you say that one adult teacher would be sufficient you do not mean it to apply to very large infants' departments?—No; I think there should be one adult teacher for every two pupil-teachers in an infants' department, but that does not apply throughout the school.

1295. With regard to the payment of pupil-teachers, you advocated additional payment being made to them?—Yes.

1296. You referred to the dressmaking in your remarks: do apprentices to the dressmaking receive remuneration as high as that paid to pupil-teachers?—I do not think they do; but, in my opinion, the importance of their work is not nearly so great, nor do I think that it requires such capabilities to be an apprentice to dressmaking as to teaching.

1297. You referred to the prizes in dressmaking: of course, you must expect those who are brought up to a profession to work their way into the higher positions, must you not?—What I said was that no woman in our public schools in New Zealand received anything like such good salaries as the heads of several of the dressmaking establishments in this town.

1298. Does not that apply to all businesses and professions—that some are more profitable than others, and that the prizes in any profession are few? How many Judges are there in comparison with the number of men who aspire to Judgeships?—I mean that teaching is of greater importance than dressmaking, and I cannot therefore see why a woman engaged in teaching should receive so much less than one engaged in dressmaking?

1299. *The Chairman.*] With regard to the appointment of pupil-teachers, you think that the best girls for the occupation are not selected?—Not always.

1300. Do you think the present system of selection defective?—Yes.

1301. Would you suggest any method by which it could be improved?—Most of the girls who are selected come from the public schools, or from the high schools. I think that the head-teachers under whom these girls have been educated ought to be consulted, and that when a man recommends that a teacher should be appointed he should be willing to take that teacher into his own school. I think that if such were the case he would be careful in recommending.

1302. Would there not be objections to pupils being appointed as teachers at the same school?—I think that if they had to go to a high school or college, where for two or three years they would go on with secondary work and then matriculate, the time they had been away from the school would be quite sufficient to overcome any difficulty that might arise with regard to discipline.

1303. Would you suggest that they should go through this preparatory course before going to work in the schools as pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1304. What is your opinion of the work that pupil-teachers have to perform now—I mean, at first? Is it of a very arduous character, or very light?—On the whole, I think they are expected to do too much, especially those who have not matriculated. They have four or five hours' teaching to do every day. If they could go to a school where they could teach part of the time and devote the other part to their educational work it would be infinitely better.

1305. Besides working in the schools during the day, as you state, they have other work to perform?—Yes; they have their work to prepare for the masters. Immediately after school they have to go to class; then they hurry home, and have the work to prepare for the next day.

1306. Have they any other work?—They have to prepare the lessons that they give. I do not think any teacher ought to go before a class and give a lesson without having prepared it. These pupil-teachers have not time to do so very often.

1307. Do they undergo instruction in view of their examination?—Yes; they have to attend classes, I believe, every day.

1308. Then, those girls have their time occupied not only in the school during the day, but when they ought to have their leisure?—Yes, unless they have matriculated; if they have matriculated before being appointed they have to go to classes twice or three times a week, and have the rest of the time to themselves.

1309. Take the case of a pupil-teacher who has not matriculated: have you had complaints about the work being excessive?—Yes; and I have seen teachers break down under it.

1310. Are not cases of breakdown rare?—I do not think so.

1311. Are breakdowns in health very common?—Yes, I think so.

1312. I see that the pupil-teachers at your school receive from £20 to £42 a year?—Yes.

1313. Do you think those girls could go into the country and live on such salaries as those?—They would find it very difficult.

1314. Even if their parents had no reluctance about their going into the country?—I do not see how they can live on £42 a year.

1315. If a rule of the kind were enforced—*i.e.*, compelling girls to go into the country—would it not prevent a great many eligible girls from following the teaching profession?—Yes.

1316. Take the girls that you are acquainted with: would many of them be able to go into the country and provide for themselves?—I do not think they should be expected to provide for themselves on such salaries.

1317. You made a reference to the want of lady representatives on this Commission: do you think the lady teachers of Wellington have no great confidence in the Commission?—Oh, no: I think they have every confidence in the Commission; but I think it would have been well had there been one or two ladies on it.

1318. I presume the lady teachers are of opinion that they ought to be better represented everywhere, are they not—not merely on the Commission, but, for instance, on the Education Board? Do you not think it would be advantageous to the ladies if they were represented there?—It would depend on the class of women that you got on the Board: some would do a great deal of good, and others harm.

1319. If it is desirable that there should be ladies on a Commission of this character, is it not equally desirable that there should be lady representatives on the Boards of Education?—Yes, if you got the right sort.

1320. And on the School Committees?—Yes; but I do not think there should be an isolated one—there should be more than one.

1321. Can you explain why it is that the ladies do not come forward and take their places on the Committee and the Boards—they are eligible?—I suppose it is a difficult question.

W. T. GRUNDY, Headmaster, Clyde Quay School, examined.

Mr. Grundy: I may say at once that I am strongly in support of a colonial scale of salaries, because I think that a scale that is made a colonial scale is likely to better not only the position of the teacher, but more particularly is likely to better the conditions of education in the country. The system that obtains now is, to my mind, not sufficiently national; it is too parochial. There are in the colony thirteen different Education Boards, with thirteen different systems, practically, of appointment and control and payment of teachers. It has therefore come about that teachers in certain districts find themselves very much underpaid compared with the teachers in more favoured districts. In support of that contention I should like to read a few figures comparing the salaries paid in the various districts to teachers holding similar positions. I have very carefully gone through the whole of the Minister's report bearing upon the salary question, and have drawn up a table, which I hand in [Exhibit 97], showing the salaries paid in the various districts, and at the end I have given the range of salary. I have no doubt the Commission has had a very considerable amount of information given in this direction, and therefore I shall content myself with showing the range of salary in the different districts of the colony. I find that in schools with an average attendance of from 20 to 30 the salaries vary from £88 to £165 for men, and from £74 to £145 for women—doing precisely the same work. In schools of from 30 to 50 the range of salary is from £110 to £235 for men, and for women from £85 to £168; from 50 to 70, from £134 to £225 for men—some of the masters at schools of this class getting less than some of those at schools in

the lower grade—and £130 to women; there are very few women in charge of schools of that class. At schools of from 70 to 100, the salaries vary from £153 to £260 for men, and the salary paid to the only woman in charge of a school of this grade is £100; from 100 to 200 the range of salary is from £175 to £290 for men, and from £100 to £180 for women—the infants' school mistresses come in here. From 200 to 300 the range is from £202 to £300; there is only one instance of a woman's salary in this grade, the amount being £175. From 300 to 400 the range is from £231 to £363, there being no women now to account for. From 400 to 500 the salaries vary from £250 to £380; from 500 to 600, £259 to £370.

1322. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do those amounts include house allowance?—They do in some cases, but not in others; I was unable to ascertain this in all cases. Then, again, I think the present system is defective in the matter of pupil-teachers. For instance, I find that in some districts pupil-teachers are employed to a greater extent than in others. The weakness of our system is largely due, I think, to the employment of pupil-teachers, inexperienced as many of them are, and must be for the first two or three years. In the Auckland District, out of a total of 790 teachers employed, 250 are pupil-teachers; in North Canterbury, out of a total of 536, 129 are pupil-teachers; in Otago, only 89 out of 511 teachers; in Wellington, 176 pupil-teachers out of 413. The Wellington District stands distinguished as the district that employs the largest proportion of pupil-teachers; Auckland, I think, comes next. I have not taken out the figures for the smaller districts, because it seems to me that the bulk of the pupil-teachers are employed in the four large districts, and I thought it was sufficient for comparison to take the figures for those districts. I may state also that I consider a colonial scale would practically ear-mark the Teachers' Salaries Fund. This fund has in the past been drawn upon for all and every purpose. I find, for instance, that from 1877 up to the end of 1899 no less a sum than £136,294 had been withdrawn by the Education Boards from the Maintenance Fund and placed to Building Account—*i.e.*, used in the building of schools. This must of necessity have affected the teachers' salaries; in fact, we know that the transference of that amount of money from the Maintenance Fund has very materially crippled the finances of Boards, compelling many to reduce the teachers' salaries. I think, therefore, that that is a strong argument in favour of a colonial scale of salaries—*i.e.*, the Salaries Fund would be ear-marked and used only for the purposes for which it was intended. Then, again, in the matter of training pupil-teachers, certain Boards have practically been training teachers for the rest of the colony. In this connection I may instance the North Canterbury Board and the Otago Board. These Boards for a number of years have supported and equipped efficient training-schools, and we and other districts have had the benefit of their work, for many teachers have, from my own knowledge, come from North Canterbury particularly to take positions in this district. There is no doubt that the teachers of North Canterbury and Otago have suffered in salaries within recent years, because of the fact that those districts have been training teachers for the rest of the colony. Then, there is another direction in which funds have been applied by Education Boards, affecting very considerably the Maintenance Fund of the Boards: I refer particularly to manual and technical education. In Wellington alone during the last ten years—1889 to 1900—£11,650 13s. 9d. has been taken from the Maintenance Fund applied to the purposes of manual and technical instruction in this district. That is practically for the support of the Technical School. The amount last year was, I think, between £1,700 and £1,800. The last point I wish to refer to is in connection with women teachers. I consider that the payment of women has been very small indeed as compared with the payment of men. Of course, I can only speak of my district, but I will instance some of the salaries paid to women in very responsible positions to-day in this district. At my own school, for instance, I have a woman teacher who has been with me for a period of twelve years, who has done excellent work, and has now got to the position of first woman assistant—and, mind you, her duties are almost similar to those of the first male assistant, except that she would not be in charge of the school were I away—she has the supervision of the girls in the playground, she has the active supervision of the sewing of the school, and has charge of a fairly large Fifth Standard class. Her salary, now that she has got practically to the top of the tree, is £90 a year.

1323. *Mr. Hill.*] What is her classification?—She has an E1 certificate. I know also of a young lady who until recently—she was lucky enough to be married about the end of last year—was at a neighbouring school. She had been teaching for at least ten years, having been an ex-pupil-teacher for at least seven or eight years, doing an assistant's work. She was in charge of a very large and important class, and was paid the munificent salary of £50 a year. Now, there are a number of such instances in this district. As an actual fact, we have been multiplying pupil-teachers to such an extent that our staffs are overcrowded with them. It is a matter of cheap labour. Positions have not been made for these teachers on the permanent staff; they have remained on as ex-pupil-teachers for years and years at a very low rate of remuneration—from £42 to £50. It was £50, but has been reduced to £42. These are my reasons, gentlemen, for strongly supporting a colonial scale.

1324. *Mr. Davidson.*] You have compared, I suppose, the two suggested scales—the first one and the alternative?—Yes.

1325. Have you noticed that the staff suggested in the alternative scale for schools having an average attendance of over 40 is a head-teacher and an assistant?—Yes.

1326. Do you consider a capable teacher can manage efficiently, without assistance, 40 children?—Yes, but not more than 40.

1327. You approve, then, of that staffing at that stage?—Yes.

1328. Do you think the first assistance given to a sole teacher should take the form of a certificated assistant teacher?—I do, for this reason: I think an inexperienced pupil-teacher is of very little use for a year or two.

1329. If it were possible to make such an arrangement as this: that a pupil-teacher, having had, say, two years' training at a fairly large school, would be sent to assist the teacher of a school

of, say, from 35 to 50, would you approve of such an arrangement?—Yes, provided the salary was sufficient for her to live on.

1330. Do you think that would be preferable to the suggested staffing—*i.e.*, a certificated teacher at 40?—It would not be preferable, but it would certainly be better than the arrangement that obtains at present.

1331. Take the next grade of school, from 40 to 90 in average attendance: the staffing suggested in the alternative scale is a headmaster and an assistant?—Yes.

1332. Is that sufficient?—Yes, I think so.

1333. The third teacher on the staff comes in at 90: do you think that a sufficient staff?—Yes.

1334. Have you considered the certificates required for the various clases of positions under the first suggested scale?—Yes.

1335. What is your opinion as to the requiring of an E2 for the teacher at a school of from 19 to 35? Do you think the certificate too high?—I think it is a little too high, considering that a teacher must spend a considerable number of years as a practical teacher before she can attain E2.

1336. Would you suggest E3 instead of E2?—Yes.

1337. Would you also suggest D3 instead of D2 for the next grade, 35 to 75?—Yes.

1338. And for the next grade D2 instead of D1?—Yes, I think that would be reasonable.

1339. What is your opinion as to requiring C1 as the certificate for the headmasters of schools of from 250 to 600?—I think that is too high. D1 would be sufficiently high.

1340. Do you consider the present method of certification of teachers' qualifications a good one?—I do not.

1341. What would you suggest in its place?—A teachers' certificate, possibly of two degrees, the higher one of the two showing length of service and experience.

1342. A good deal has been said about equal pay for equal work as far as the sexes are concerned: would you give an opinion upon that question?—I am very strongly in favour of better payment for women, as I have already stated; but I am not in favour of equal pay for equal work, for this reason particularly: that in connection with many positions it is demanded of a man that he shall be a married man; for instance, when applications are called for many positions it is well known amongst us that an unmarried man has no chance. Such being the case, I consider that a married man should be paid at least a little more than an unmarried woman.

1343. Do you think it costs the State as much to train a woman as it does to train a man for the teaching profession?—It costs more to train women, because so many of them leave the profession.

1344. But apart from that?—It costs just the same.

1345. Do you know what percentage of women as compared with men leave the profession after a short period?—Yes; I believe from 60 per cent. to 80 per cent.

1346. Have you heard that four women for every one man leave the profession a short period after completing their apprenticeship?—I saw that that statement was made in Dunedin.

1347. Then, you would give that as one reason why women should not be paid equally with men?—Yes.

1348. You think that the disparity between the salaries paid to men and those paid to women is too great?—Altogether too great.

1349. I take it, then, that you would be in favour of reducing the disparity, but not equalising the salaries?—Exactly.

1350. I should like your opinion on this point: do you consider the average woman is physically fitted to teach and control, say, a large Fourth Standard class of 50 or more at a mixed school?—I should say that the average woman teacher of this district would be able to manage a mixed class of from 45 to 50.

1351. Not up to 60?—No, not up to 60; I think the average woman should not be called upon to manage a class of anything like 60.

1352. But you admit there are exceptional women who do this work?—There are.

1353. Do you think it would be advisable, in any scheme that this Commission may draw up, to make it possible for women to occupy the positions of, say, second or third assistant on the staff of large schools?—Yes, provided that it is clearly understood that in the large schools there must be a certain number of men on the staff.

1354. Do you agree with the provision in the suggested scale where it states that there shall not be more males than females on the staff of a school?—I do not think you would get more males than females on any staff in New Zealand.

1355. Then, you approve of that suggestion?—Yes.

1356. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think the adoption of a colonial scale would in any way minimise the influence and control of the Boards over their teachers?—I cannot see that it would in any way.

1357. Do you think that the adoption of a colonial scale would in any way be a safeguard to the Boards' own finances?—Yes, I do.

1358. In what way?—For instance, in the matter of technical education, Boards rightly become enthusiastic in the establishment of some system of manual and technical education, and if they are not careful they pay away more money than they really can afford; but if there were a colonial scale the Salaries Fund would be ear-marked, and they would not be able to do that. It would be a protection in that way.

1359. Am I to understand from what has fallen from you in connection with manual and technical education that you are in any way opposed to the introduction of manual instruction in our schools?—No; I am strongly in support of it.

1360. Then, in what way have the funds that you said have been taken by the Wellington Board from the Maintenance Fund been expended?—Principally on the classes established in this building.

1361. Do you think it a right thing that the funds voted for the education of children of school age should be applied to those above the school age?—I do not think they should be, but I think the Board was within its rights in doing so.

1362. On what principle is the scale of salaries of your Board based?—I should have to consider a long time before I could answer that question.

1363. I have been trying to find out, but cannot, and I thought that, perhaps, you could help me?—I can only answer, like another witness, that several scales have been drawn up from time to time; that these scales have not affected teachers already in the employ of the Board; and so the matter has become very complicated.

1364. What has been your teaching experience?—Thirty-five years.

1365. In what parts of the world?—I was a teacher in Birmingham; then I was in Queensland for a period of two years, and have been here now for over twenty-one years.

1366. Did you go through a pupil-teacher's course in England?—Yes.

1367. Through a training-college?—Yes.

1368. And possess a D certificate?—I do.

1369. With regard to the appointment of pupil-teachers, we have already had it given in evidence that there is an excessive number of pupil-teachers here: has there been a tendency on the part of the Board to restore the balance of finance by employing a large number of these pupil-teachers and ex-pupil-teachers? Is that the reason?—I would prefer that you asked some official of the Board that question.

1370. Do you think that the system of appointing pupil-teachers in this district is satisfactory?—I do not.

1371. What is the system?—As indicated by Miss Craig, the system is one of appointment by the Board itself.

1372. Are not the head-teachers of the schools from which the pupil-teachers are drawn required to make confidential reports to the Board on candidates for teacherships?—No; I think the teachers, as a rule, give letters of recommendation to candidates applying; that is the utmost that is done in that direction at the present time.

1373. Is there any entrance examination?—No.

1374. When do the pupil-teachers first come up for examination?—At the end of their first year.

1375. Is any responsibility thrown on a teacher in connection with recommending a candidate for a pupil-teachership?—None whatever.

1376. Are you aware that in some districts the head-teacher at the school where the candidate has been educated is asked confidentially, "Are you prepared to recommend the appointment of this teacher to your own school"?—I believe that is so.

1377. Do you think that a wise provision?—I do.

1378. Do you find that through appointing pupil-teachers without an entrance examination you get many who are quite unable to do the literary work at the end of a year or two?—That has been found to be the case in the past.

1379. Do you think that is a desirable state of affairs?—No.

1380. You are in favour of an entrance examination?—Yes.

1381. Before a pupil-teacher is appointed, does he or she serve any probation?—A pupil-teacher is usually sent to a school for a period of a few months, and if there is no adverse report he or she is considered to be on the staff.

1382. Does not the teacher give any lesson before either of the Inspectors, and be specially reported on?—I think not.

1383. Are you aware that in some districts of the colony the following is the system: Confidential recommendation by the headmaster; probation for three months, with reports at the end of every month; a lesson given before the Inspector; then consultation between the headmaster and the Inspector, and official recommendation by the Inspector?—I think that is an excellent system; I did not know such a system was in force.

1384. Would you be prepared to recommend the adoption of such a system in Wellington?—Yes, I should.

1385. Coming back to the question of scale, I understand that your Board does not adhere to the present scale?—That is so.

1386. Do you approve of the system of giving bonuses for certificates?—No, I do not approve of the bonus system at all; everything should be included in the salary.

1387. Do you think that pupil-teachers would suffer in the care and attention given by the headmaster to their training if the remuneration for the instruction of pupil-teachers were a part of the salary as proposed by the colonial scheme?—No, I do not think so; I think that if a man is at all conscientious he will take good care that his pupil-teachers do not suffer in any way.

1388. It has been stated in evidence that unless the head-teacher received special remuneration for the instruction of pupil-teachers he might neglect them: you do not agree with that statement?—No, I do not.

1389. Does your Board consider, in determining the payment of its teachers, the differences in the cost of living in different parts of the Wellington District?—I do not think so.

1390. Would it be practicable to do so?—It would be a difficult matter.

1391. Do you think there are compensating advantages in different parts of the district—*i.e.*, other things balancing the extra cost of living in some parts?—Yes, in many cases that is so, I think.

1392. Do you think that in drawing up a colonial scale it would be practicable to take the difference in cost of living into consideration?—No, I do not.

1393. You have travelled over different parts of the colony?—Yes.

1394. Have you found any great difference in the cost of living at the different centres?—As far as I know there is not a great difference, except in regard to house-rent.

1395. Has your Board any definite scheme of promotion?—I do not think so; I do not know that it has any definite scheme.

1396. Is there an adequate supply of male pupil-teachers?—Not in this district.

1397. What do you put that down to?—On account of the precariousness of the profession, for one reason. Then, again, the inducements are not sufficient to tempt young lads to enter the profession. Were the inducements made better I believe more would enter.

1398. What class of teachers under your Board are the worst paid?—Our women teachers.

1399. I believe the teachers of this district have considered this matter very carefully within the last month or so?—Yes.

1400. Are the teachers satisfied with the present state of affairs?—They are not.

1401. Are they as a whole anything like unanimously in favour of a colonial scale?—I think that the teachers in this district are, on the whole, in favour of a colonial scale.

1402. *Mr. Luke.*] Are you familiar with the proposed alternative scale?—Fairly so.

1403. Do you think that the staffing proposed in that scale should be so arranged that the assistants should be paid at the highest rate paid in any educational district in the colony?—I hope that may be so.

1404. Would you approve of that?—Yes, I think so.

1405. You stated that the sum of £136,294 had been taken from the Maintenance Fund and placed to Building Account since 1877: does that include the whole of the colony?—Yes.

1406. Are you aware of the fact that some of that has been paid back again?—I am not.

1407. Some of it has been returned; I know that in the Auckland District that has been so?—I am very glad to hear it.

1408. With regard to pupil-teachers, are there no pupil-teachers' examinations at all here?—Yes; at the end of each year of service; but there is no entrance examination.

1409. No candidates' examination?—No.

1410. From your experience is the money that is given to the School Committee enough to keep the school grounds in order?—No, it is not enough; teachers in this district generally have to supplement the allowances to the Committees by concerts, &c.

1411. A larger amount should be given to the School Fund?—Yes, if possible, that should be increased.

1412. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you recognise that the more there is given to the School Committees under the present system the less there is for the teachers?—I understand that, but, still, the Committee are responsible for the carrying-on of the schools, and there should be sufficient funds.

1413. I suppose you do not feel qualified to pass an opinion on whether the 11s. 3d. is sufficient?—It is more than sufficient in the case of the Clyde Quay School; we do not get anything like it.

1414. Do you consider that teachers, as a whole, are insufficiently paid?—I do.

1415. Would the extra 5s. capitation grant, if paid to Education Boards, enable them to pay the same salaries as those suggested in the proposed scheme?—I can hardly answer that question; Mr. Hogben, I suppose, will be able to say whether that is so.

1416. Would it in any way tend to minimise the anomalies that exist just now?—No doubt it would.

1417. Supposing a capitation of £4 were given to the strong Boards as well as to the weak ones, would that tend to minimise the anomalies?—No; it would accentuate the difficulty.

1418. That is one of the reasons why a colonial scale is necessary?—Undoubtedly so.

1419. Have the teachers in this district expressed an opinion with regard to the centralisation of the Inspectors?—Yes.

1420. Are they in favour of it?—Yes, strongly in favour of the centralisation of the Inspectors.

1421. Are you aware that the Inspectors, in conference assembled, passed a resolution to that effect?—I am.

1422. Do the teachers themselves consider that the placing of the Inspectors under the central department would lead to uniformity of examination and inspection?—We do consider it would.

1423. You stated, in reply to a question, that you are opposed to bonuses being granted on certificates?—Yes.

1424. And, consequently, are opposed to fines being imposed on account of teachers not holding certain certificates?—Yes.

1425. With regard to the salaries paid to male and female teachers for doing similar work: supposing we differentiate to the extent of 10 per cent. in the lower salaries, should the difference increase as the salaries increase?—Yes, slightly; from 10 per cent. to 25 per cent.

1426. Do you consider that more power should be given to the Education Boards in the way of transferring and promoting teachers—*i.e.*, within a Board's own education district, and perhaps to the different Education Boards in the respective districts?—Yes, if possible.

1427. Do you consider that the adoption of a colonial scale would give facilities in that direction?—Yes.

1428. With regard to scholarships, does the Wellington Education Board give sufficient scholarships to encourage the children of poorer parents to increase their education?—One would like to see more; there is very keen competition for the scholarships that are given.

1429. Are there separate scholarships for town and country pupils?—Yes.

1430. Would you support the unification of the system by granting scholarships and exhibitions from the primary schools to the secondary schools, and from the secondary schools to the universities?—Very heartily.

1431. With regard to the appointment of teachers, do you consider that the sole power of appointment of teachers should be in the hands of the Board?—I do.

1432. And, failing that, the Legislature should define what they mean by "consulting the Committee"?—Yes, I think so.

1433. With regard to truancy, you have a Truant Inspector in the Wellington District?—Yes.

1434. Does he do much good?—Yes, considerable good.

1435. Does the Magistrate, when convictions are obtained, give costs?—There have been very few prosecutions; I cannot call to mind whether costs have been granted or not.

1436. As to the working average, do you consider 50 per cent. too low?—Yes.

1437. What would you suggest it should be raised to?—I think it might be very well raised to 60 per cent. or 65 per cent., or even 70 per cent., if the colony could afford it. I have thought over the matter, and it suggested itself to me that it would not be a bad idea to take the average for the highest quarter of the year.

1438. And pay the capitation on that?—Yes.

1439. Of course, considerable latitude would be required in the various districts?—Yes.

1440. With regard to payment on the average attendance, do you think we should take into consideration the previous quarter's average attendance, or the previous four quarters'?—The previous four quarters.

1441. Do you advocate the increase of salary by units or grades?—By units.

1442. You are aware that the cost of living varies in the different districts: do you consider that it would be in any way practicable to differentiate between the salaries paid to those in the districts in which the cost of living is exceptionally high and those in the districts where it is low?—I do not think that could be very readily done; there would be great difficulties in the way. It seems to me that it is more important that the very great differences in salaries should be adjusted rather than differences in the cost of living.

1443. The salaries paid to the men in the railway and postal services are the same in different parts of the colony, though the cost of living varies?—Yes.

1444. With regard to the election of members of Education Boards, do you consider they should be elected on the popular franchise?—Yes.

1445. If such were the case, would you advocate that the Boards so elected should have the administration of the lands that are now administered by the School Commissioners?—I have not given consideration to that.

1446. With reference to the syllabus, do you consider that we should differentiate between the work expected from teachers at country schools, where they are unassisted and all standards are represented, and that expected from large, fully staffed town schools?—Certainly.

1447. In what direction?—Option should be given to teachers to choose certain class subjects.

1448. As to superannuation, have the Institute passed a resolution respecting superannuation or retiring-allowances?—Yes.

1449. What do they advocate?—We have striven earnestly to draw up a scheme, but have found ourselves quite unable to do so because we have no fund to rely on, and we cannot see that it is possible, under existing circumstances, to obtain a superannuation scheme; but we have more hope now, because we think it is more practicable to bring into operation a superannuation scheme under a colonial scale than under the existing scale.

1450. The suggested scale stipulates that the assistants shall alternate, male and female: do you consider that that is practicable, or would it be better in the larger schools if the first two assistants were males?—The latter is undoubtedly preferable.

1451. Do you approve of the proposed reduction of £10 in the salary of a male teacher at a small school when a sewing-mistress is appointed?—No.

1452. Do you consider that in this district there are too many small schools?—Yes, I think there are.

1453. Do you consider that the Legislature should lay down a minimum attendance, below which a school should not be established?—Yes, I do.

1454. In the appointment of teachers in this district, is preference given to female teachers because their labour is cheaper?—I would not like to say that.

1455. Would you suggest that provision should be made for the training of ex-pupil-teachers at some of the larger schools, such as is in vogue at Napier just now?—Yes.

1456. You consider that in those districts in which there are not normal schools the want of duly trained teachers is severely felt?—Yes, I think so.

1457. Do you think that the adoption of such a scale as the suggested one would in any way tend to weaken the power of Education Boards?—I fail to see it.

1458. You do not consider that their power is dependent on the possibility or probability of their now and again adopting a different scale?—Their power lies in the appointment and dismissal of teachers.

1459. *Mr. Hill.*] Did you state that you are a specially trained teacher?—Yes, trained in England.

1460. You have seen many changes that have taken place under the Education Boards during the twenty-one years that you have been here?—Yes.

1461. You realise that Education Boards have been required of late to carry out entirely different duties from what they did at first?—Yes.

1462. You realise that the educational demands of the colony have been materially altered?—Yes.

1463. Do you realise also that these various demands have been required to be carried out by Education Boards? Was it their duty to carry them out?—Yes; I think they were the authorities that were naturally expected to carry them out.

1464. They were expected to carry out all these educational duties?—Yes.

1465. You are aware that formerly Education Boards received a grant of £4 5s. *per capita?*—Yes.

1466. And that this was lowered to £4, and then to £3 15s.?—Yes.

1467. Notwithstanding these reductions, the Education Boards have been required to carry out these heavier and constantly increasing duties?—Yes.

1468. The demands which the Education Boards were called upon to supply were, in the first place, in connection with the towns. These having been settled, increased demands have been made from the country: you are aware of that?—Yes.

1469. Well, then, with the reduced capitation grants, has it been possible, however willing Education Boards might have been, for them to meet all the demands that have been made upon them without trenching on the salaries of teachers?—I do not think it has been possible.

1470. Then, you do not think the various Education Boards have been to blame?—In many cases—for instance, in the abstraction of funds from the Maintenance Account for building purposes—I think the Boards could not do otherwise.

1471. You are aware, I suppose, that the Education Department must have been aware of these circumstances?—The Educational Institute has constantly called the Minister's attention to the fact that money was being transferred from Maintenance to Building Account.

1472. Would you, therefore, blame the Education Boards for these troubles that have come about, or have they been due to the want of foresight on the part of the Government?—I do not know that there was want of foresight on the part of the Government. Perhaps the condition of things at that time did not enable them to do what they might have wished to do.

1473. But they have been aware of the growing needs of the country?—Yes.

1474. And that education above all things should be the first factor in the Government of a people?—Yes.

1475. That being so, if this state of affairs has really existed, ought the Education Boards to be blamed for the defects that exist?—I do not think that Education Boards should be blamed for many of them.

1476. But the lowering of salaries you recognise is the outcome of a deficiency of funds?—Exactly.

1477. And you recognise that even in your own district it is desirable to foster technical education?—Yes, but not at the expense of primary education.

1478. But you recognise that it is desirable to foster it?—Yes.

1479. And therefore any defects that may be apparent in the management simply arise from the fact that technical education, which has come into the forefront of late, has been required really to be carried on by the Education Boards?—Yes; but I do not think the Education Boards need have taken from the Salaries Fund money to establish technical schools, for instance.

1480. But, then, the department said, "That is the money out of which you have to carry out that education"——

Mr. Hogben: The department has not said anything of the kind at any time.

1481. *Mr. Hill.*] Was there not a tendency, therefore, to trench upon the Maintenance Fund of the teachers?—There has no doubt been more than a tendency; they have actually done it.

1482. To the extent of £136,000 odd?—Not all for technical education.

1483. But for that and building purposes?—They are different things.

1484 The Maintenance Fund has been trenched upon to supply the growing needs of the country?—Yes.

1485. The Education Boards had to take that money out of the Teachers' Salaries Fund?—Yes.

1486. You claim that if a colonial scale is adopted this tendency to trench upon the Maintenance Fund will not exist?—That is so.

1487. The salaries, of course, will be provided irrespective of making provision for building and technical education?—And scholarships, and so on.

1488. And the training of pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1489. All these items have been met out of funds which should have gone to pay the teachers' salaries?—Yes, they have been in the past.

1490. You think that a colonial system will obviate that difficulty?—I do.

1491. We will suppose now that a regulation were issued by the Minister of Education to the effect that a certain amount of the capitation should be ear-marked by the various Education Boards, and that a capitation sufficient to meet these growing demands for good salaries for teachers should be paid by the department, up to, say, a capitation of £4 5s.: would you then approve of a colonial scheme?—In any case I should prefer a colonial scheme.

1492. A generalised scheme is better than a specialised one?—I believe it is the only safety.

1493. You believe that a colonial scheme will be better for the teachers themselves?—I do.

1494. And better for the country?—Yes.

1495. You have had experience in England as to the plan of certification that is adopted there?—Yes.

1496. Is there not a wide difference between the method of certification of teachers that is adopted in the old country and that proposed in this scheme?—A very great difference.

1497. Do you think that a simple plan of issuing a teacher's certificate would be preferable to the present plan?—I do.

1498. Supposing that the certificate be taken in three divisions, equal, say, to the E, D, and C at the present time, do you think that would meet the present requirements of our primary schools?—I think the E certificate is rather too low; I should prefer two certificates to three.

1499. Would you call them Divisions 1 and 2?—Yes.

1500. What would you have the lower one equal to?—Equal to the present D certificate.

1501. You would not admit into the profession any one with a lower certificate than D?—No.

1502. With regard to the instruction of pupil-teachers, you are aware that under the suggested scheme no payment is made for the instruction of pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1503. It is included in the salary?—Yes.

1504. Take a school like yours, what is your opinion as to the requiring of all the certificated teachers on the staff to give instruction to these pupil-teachers?—Provided that under the scale the salaries of assistant teachers are considerably raised?

1505. Yes. Assuming that the same provision were made in the matter of the assistants as is made in the matter of the headmaster?—Then I can see no objection to it.

1506. Do you think it would strengthen the work?—I do.

1507. Do you think provision should also be made that in the training of pupil-teachers, which is of high importance in the after-lives of the children, criticism lessons should be given so as to train these teachers?—I do.

1508. As to scholarships, what is your opinion as to the claim which some have set up, that all pupils who pass Standard VI. should, if their parents are willing to make the sacrifice, have a right to go to the high schools to continue their studies?—If the country can afford it, I think it would be an excellent thing to do.

1509. Would you under such conditions foster the continuance of higher work in the smaller schools where there are ex-Sixth-Standard pupils attending, by giving a special grant to the teachers of those schools if they choose to carry on instruction in more advanced work? If you allowed children in close proximity to the high schools to go there free, would you foster secondary work in the country schools in the same way by giving an extra salary—so much per head, for example—on account of the instruction of pupils who have passed Standard VI.?—I am afraid there would be a tendency in such cases, I will not say to neglect the work of the primary part of the school, but at any rate not to give that strict attention to it that should be given.

1510. You think there would be some likelihood of their neglecting other work?—I think so; and I speak from experience. Some years ago the Masterton School was a district high school, and higher work was done in the upper classes, and it was my experience that that work did tend to interfere with the work of the school generally.

1511. Do you think that the Education Boards should have the right to remove teachers from one school district to another if they find it desirable to do so?—I do.

1512. You think it would be beneficial to the work of education?—Yes.

1513. You recognise that that would be limiting the functions of School Committees?—I do.

1514. Do you think that the functions of School Committees should be limited?—Yes, in all appointments of teachers.

1515. You are strongly of the opinion that the power of Education Boards should be limited in the way of payment of teachers' salaries?—I do not see that their power would be limited.

1516. If their power of distribution were taken away, surely their powers would be limited?—You would hardly say their powers were limited when a special grant was made for, say, scholarship purposes.

1517. Do they give it in whatever way they like?—The grant is for scholarship purposes, and only scholarship purposes.

1518. If the grants were to be "ear-marked," and so much paid for teachers' salaries, do you think that Education Boards could distribute the money as well as the central department?—I do not think Education Boards should have the power of distributing the money, except according to a colonial scale.

1519. Can you tell me of any department, in New Zealand or elsewhere, where a grant is given simply for distribution—that is, where there is an important educational body, and that body has no voice as to the method of distributing a certain amount which it passes through its hands?—I do not quite see what you mean.

1520. It is proposed under this colonial scale to simply pay the Education Boards a certain amount of money for distribution to teachers?—Yes.

1521. Can you tell me of any similar Board or authority, either in New Zealand or elsewhere, under which such a plan as this suggested is carried out?—In all the Government departments I presume the salaries are fixed—say, the Railway Department.

1522. But the department fixes its own salaries?—No; I have been present in Parliament and have heard the list of salaries for each department called out and passed.

1523. The office is only a distributing office?—Yes, that is so.

1524. *Mr. Smith.*] What in your opinion should be the smallest number of pupils for which a school should be established?—Not less than 15.

1525. Would you give no assistance to a group of children of less than 15 if they were beyond the reach of a school?—A capitation allowance might be made for them, but there should be no establishment of an actual school.

1526. Then, you approve of the provision in the proposed scale that any school of from 1 to 14 should receive a capitation grant of £5?—Yes.

1527. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] You said that there were too many small schools?—Yes.

1528. You have just said you thought that where there are 15 children a school should be established?—I said I would limit the number to 15.

1529. And not establish a school under 15?—Not under 15.

1530. Your Board does not establish a school under 15—it is an aided school?—Just so.

1531. The Board only grants the capitation, so that the small schools cost the Board comparatively nothing?—Yes.

1532. It appears to me, then, that it is not right to say the Board has established too many schools?—I mean in this way: schools have been established too near one another.

1533. You think the children in the back blocks should receive education?—Exactly; every consideration should be given them.

1534. It was stated by a teacher somewhere that the members of the Teachers' Institute have passed a resolution to the effect that the whole system of education should be centralised—that it should be under the department, and there should be no Boards and no Committees?—No such resolution has been passed by the Institute.

1535. *Mr. Hogben.*] You were asked a question with regard to the distribution of money for scholarships: is it not a fact that scholarship regulations must be approved by the Minister?—I believe that is so.

1536. You said that you think the salaries of all mistresses should be raised?—Yes.

1537. Have you compared the salaries of male and female teachers in the Wellington District, say, in schools of from 20 to 40?—I have.

1538. Eight of the male teachers in these schools are getting salaries above the proposed scale?—I was not aware of it.

1539. Do you know how many female teachers would gain under the proposed scale?—Every one of them.

1540. No; one would not. Supposing there was a fairer distribution of the money for the salaries of teachers, male and female, at every one of these schools, have you any idea whether the amount taken from the male teachers to bring them down to the average of the other male teachers in the Wellington District, or to the salaries provided in the colonial scale—they are both about the same—would bring the female teachers up?—I have not gone into that question.

1541. You have noticed that the salaries of the female teachers in these schools would be brought up considerably?—Yes.

1542. Have you noticed also that very few male teachers would suffer?—Yes.

1543. So that you do not consider it likely that the excess money now paid to the male teachers would bring the female teachers up sufficiently if divided among them?—No.

1544. The effect of the colonial scale would be to produce a fairer distribution of salaries among the most numerous class of schools in the colony—those from 20 to 40?—Yes.

1545. So that there would not be enough money to raise them, except under the colonial scale?—Yes.

1546. I suppose you would be in favour of safeguarding the interests of the present holders of office—at all events, for four years, or something like that—whatever time is allowed for bringing a colonial scale into operation?—Yes, I think it would be desirable.

1547. If that were done do you think present holders of posts would have any real ground for fear?—If that were done they would have no ground for fear.

1548. Are you aware that in the Wellington District there are twenty-two schools with an average of less than 15?—I did not know there were so many.

1549. There were more than 15 attending those schools when they were established by the Board?—Yes; they have fallen since.

1550. You would not be in favour of putting schools under any minimum in a separate class by themselves, subject to a special grant?—Yes, if that could be done.

1551. What if they fell in number?—It seems that in a colonial scale that would be difficult to arrange.

1552. I was going to ask you whether a colonial scale should not include all schools?—Yes.

1553. Otherwise a man might suffer if his school fell below the minimum you have named for a school on the colonial scale?—Yes; it is all a question of money.

1554. It is within your knowledge that schools vary a good deal?—Yes; particularly country schools.

1555. You said that you thought it would be better that salaries should be paid on the average of four quarters instead of one?—Yes.

1556. That would tend to make the salaries more steady?—Yes. Or, better still, let the salaries be paid on the average attendance of the highest quarter in the year.

1557. Assuming there was a highest quarter in any given district, and you granted the same kind of concession throughout the colony, what effect would that have on the scale? If you had the same amount of money to distribute, you would simply have to bring down the scale so-much a unit, would you not?—If the amount is paid as capitation on the highest quarter more money would be paid.

1558. It would be simply another way of asking for more money?—I suppose so.

1559. Then, would it not be the most direct way to take the safest basis for payment?—I suppose it would be.

1560. Would you take the average attendance? Is not the question rather, which is the safest basis as to the proper measure of the size of the school?—Yes.

1561. Do you think the attendance on the highest quarter of the year is the safest measure of the size of the school?—It is the safest as far as the teachers are concerned.

1562. Do you not see that it would to a large extent encourage an up and down tendency at a part of the year, and that a teacher who has to teach steadily a large average of pupils throughout the whole of the year really has as much work to do as the teacher who has to teach a larger average for one quarter and a smaller average another quarter?—Yes.

1563. Then, why should he be paid less?—It would not make such a vast difference.

1564. Yes, in some districts. Why should he be paid less? Would you bring down the scale and bring down the payment and the staff in schools where the attendance was steady to put them up where it was most unsteady?—It would be only for a limited time that it would be unsteady; for the major part of the time it would be steady. But that was only a suggestion of mine.

1565. *The Chairman.*] Do you think a colonial scale of salaries can possibly be devised that will give uniform or general satisfaction?—I believe that a colonial scale of salaries can be devised that would give general satisfaction.

1566. If that scale is arranged on the basis of capitation stated in our order of reference—that is, £4 a head—do you think teachers in every district in New Zealand will be satisfied if the salaries in some cases are modified or reduced in order that those in every instance where there are glaring inequalities may be raised to a reasonable level?—Yes; provided that the present occupants are protected, as suggested by the Inspector-General, for a period of three or four years.

1567. What effect do you think the introduction of this new system will have on the Education Boards: will it improve them in any way; will it diminish their powers, do you think; will it add to their importance or reduce it?—It does not seem to me that it will diminish their power or detract from their importance. They will still have the control of teachers and the control of education within their districts. It will simply mean the ear-marking of a sum of money for a specific purpose.

1568. But is objection not taken to the parochial system even with regard to appointments? I think in your opening statement you said the teachers of this district objected to the parochial system in connection with the making of appointments?—I do not remember that; I have no recollection of saying so.

1569. Have you not stated already that the wish of the teachers of the Wellington District is that some method should be devised by which teachers could be exchanged between different districts—that is, sent from one to another by the Education Department? And did you not go further, and say that this would get rid of the present parochial system?—No, I did not.

1570. Was no reference made to the parochial system?—That was when I first started; but it was not with regard to appointments.

1571. With regard to salaries?—Yes.

1572. Then, if the parochial system of fixed salaries is bad, is not the parochial system of making appointments also bad, or defective?—I am not prepared to speak on the question of appointments; I have not come prepared to do that, but I am prepared to speak to the question of salaries.

1573. If a colonial scale of salaries is introduced and passed by the Legislature, and the power of fixing salaries is removed from the hands of the Education Boards, do you not think that the power of making appointments must naturally follow, and be placed under the central department?—I do not see it at all.

1574. The one would not necessarily follow the other?—I do not think so.

1575. If you do away with the power which is now exercised by the Education Boards, and make it a matter that is quite immaterial to those bodies whether the expenditure on salaries is small or large, will that not very likely lead to the multiplication of schools, and to a total disregard of the necessity for fair and reasonable economy?—I think the Education Boards are composed of fair and reasonable men, and they will not, as you suggest, simply because they have not the actual control of the salary fund, unduly multiply schools.

1576. Do you think the teachers will be safer with regard to salaries if they are in the hands of a central department than in the hands of the Boards?—I hope so.

1577. Have you contemplated the method by which votes are sometimes rushed through Parliament in the early hours of the morning—it might be 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning—when the members have been sitting up for perhaps nearly twenty-fours? Do you think that would be a more satisfactory way of arranging for the payment of these men and women than the method adopted at present?—I do not anticipate that teachers' salaries will be flung on the floor of the House and discussed by members. I anticipate that there will be a grant made as at present, which will be apportioned by the central department to the teachers according to the size of the schools, and so on, and will be distributed by the Boards. I do not see that there is any such danger as you suggest.

1578. Then, do you think the scale of salaries should be passed without any discussion?—I do not suggest that.

1579. Do you not think that the expenditure on education will be very much discussed, not merely by Parliament, but by the country?—It is discussed now. The capitation grant at present is £3 15s. a head. There is proposed to be a grant of, at least, £4—possibly we may hope for £4 5s.—per head, which will enable the department to do what is proposed to be done.

1580. If the capitation were increased, as you have suggested, to, say, £4 5s., do you not think the Education Boards would be able to distribute the money in a way which would give satisfaction to their employés?—No; I think it would simply accentuate the difficulty, because the smaller districts could not possibly even then pay the salaries which would be paid in the larger districts. The larger districts would still pay larger salaries than the smaller districts, and this would be unfair.

1581. Is there no advantage in allowing each district to manage the money at its disposal?—There is; but when a series of experiments result in a decrease of salary throughout the various educational districts—and a decrease has taken place, I believe, as often as three times in as many years—the experiment is rather at the expense of the teachers.

1582. Assuming it is necessary to improve salaries, and to bring about a uniform system, what about the incidental allowances to Committees? Do you not think that they ought to be regulated

in a similar way?—I suppose they would be. There would be a special grant made for the purposes of Boards and for the purposes of School Committees.

1583. From your own knowledge of the difficulties that School Committees have to undergo in this respect, do you think that the present incidental allowances, say, in this district, are anything like sufficient?—They are not sufficient.

1584. Do you consider that a much larger expenditure is necessary in that direction?—I would not say a much larger, but a slightly larger expenditure is necessary for the good of the schools.

1585. With reference to the buildings, do you think that the schools are kept in proper repair, and that the building grant is sufficient at present to meet requirements?—No, I do not think it is.

1586. Do you think that the alterations that are now contemplated, if made, will maintain the interest that is now taken by parents generally in the appointment of Committees and members of Boards?—Yes; I think it will not interfere in any way with that interest.

1587. Is it not likely to increase the amount of State patronage that can be exercised at the expense and cost of the local institutions that have been in existence ever since the Education Act was introduced—I mean the Boards and Committees?—I do not see the contention at all.

1588. Then, you do not think the change, if made, will make any vital alteration in that respect?—I do not think so.

1589. There is one important question that has not been put to you: Do you think the method in our large schools, say, in the city here and other similar places, of having boys' and girls' schools distinct from each other would be any advantage on the present system of mixed schools?—I do not think so.

1590. Do you think it is any disadvantage?—I do not think the mixed-school system is a disadvantage.

1591. Then, do you think that the separate system is any disadvantage?—The separate system would be a distinct disadvantage, inasmuch as it would be far more expensive than the present.

1592. Is it more expensive in the case of the Mount Cook schools?—I was not referring particularly to the Mount Cook schools, but to the schools throughout the colony.

1593. I am taking these schools as an illustration: are the Mount Cook schools more expensive or less efficient than the combined schools?—No.

1594. In proportion to numbers?—As separate schools, as an actual fact, they are less expensive, because you pay women teachers less.

1595. In a case like that, where you have two separate staffs, one female and the other male, what difference would you make between the pay of the teachers?—You must understand that this is an exceptional case. There is but one girls' school in this city, and I think there is not one in Auckland, nor Christchurch, nor Dunedin; it is quite an exceptional school.

1596. But what do you think would be a fair salary for a female teacher at the girls' school, compared with the salary paid to a male teacher at the boys' school, who is doing precisely similar work?—There should not be a difference of more than 25 per cent.

1597. What difference would you make in a mixed school between the salary paid to a lady teacher and that paid to a male teacher?—That would depend upon the grade; there should not be a difference of more than 10 per cent. between the salary paid to the third male assistant and that paid to the third female assistant.

1598. *Mr. Hill.*] Would you suggest that only 75 per cent. of the capitation grant should be made by the department on account of girls?—No.

1599. You suggest that the same amount of capitation should be paid, and yet you would pay the female teacher only 75 per cent. of the salary paid to the male teacher?—Yes.

1600. *The Chairman.*] You do not believe, then, in equal pay for equal work?—I do believe in the abstract principle; but I contend that teachers are somewhat apart from the general view of things here, because it is demanded of a master in many cases that he shall be a married man before he occupies a certain position.

1601. You have seen the two proposed scales?—Yes.

1602. Do you think that the present staff in the Wellington District is sufficient?—No, not by a long way.

1603. You think it ought to be strengthened?—Yes.

1604. Of which scale would you approve with regard to the staffing?—The alternative scale.

1605. Is the staffing proposed in that scale as strong as that proposed in the original scale?—Not quite, but still I think it is strong enough, and it is as strong as can well be given under the circumstances—I am alluding, of course, to the £4 limit.

1606. Do you think that the assistants in the main schools should be drafted from the country?—If they are able to do the work, I do not see why they should not be.

1607. But, supposing the salaries are modified in such a way that the assistants in the main schools will naturally apply for situations in the country, do you not think that will be an improvement on the present system?—Yes.

T. H. Gill, M.A., LL.B., Headmaster, Newtown School, examined.

Mr. Gill: I wish to place before you, first of all, what has been done by the New Zealand Educational Institute in connection with this matter of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries. On looking over the records, I find that in 1888 a committee of the representatives of the New Zealand Educational Institute in council assembled had no recommendation to make on the subject of a colonial scale. In 1889 a resolution was passed advocating a more uniform scale of salaries; in 1890 a resolution was passed deprecating the low salaries paid in the smaller educational districts; in 1891 the resolution passed asked for a more

uniform scale of salaries; in 1892 the resolution took the same shape; in 1893 it was carried in the form of "uniform scale of salaries"; in 1894 the record is simply that the resolution was carried. Now, in 1895 the expression "staff and salaries" makes its appearance. A similar resolution was carried in 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, and 1901—in 1899 by twenty-nine votes to three; and in 1900 unanimously. In 1901, at the beginning of the present year, the resolution was "carried with acclamation." These are the records. I make this statement as secretary of the New Zealand Educational Institute, because I have the information at my disposal, and I do not think that you have had it from anyone else. I want to make a remark or two in connection with the question of a colonial scale (I am not speaking now as the representative of the New Zealand Educational Institute, these are my own views). It seems to me that a colonial scale is necessary in the interests of the teachers themselves. I think that men and women who are doing precisely the same work under very similar conditions, and who have equal qualifications, ought to receive an equal rate of pay. Without that I think there must be dissatisfaction; and I think that some of the dissatisfaction in the colony to-day is due to the disparity between the salaries paid to men and those paid to women. Then, I think that it is in the interests of scholars that a colonial scale should be introduced. It will be generally conceded that the tendency under the present system is for the most capable men and women to be drawn into the service of the larger Boards, where the larger salaries are paid, and I cannot see that that is fair to the scholars in the smaller districts; I contend that they ought to have equal educational advantages. I consider it is in the interests of education generally that there should be a colonial scale. The only way in which we can get a really good system of education is by having a proper system of pupil-teachers, followed by a system of training in some training-college; and I am inclined to believe that we should have a very much better system if we had a uniform pupil-teacher system, with uniform training, *plus* a uniform system of college-work after the pupil-teacher's course was over. I say that with regard to a colonial scale generally. I wish to speak now with regard to the proposed colonial scale. Taken as a whole, it has certain advantages. For men, the scale for assistants in Auckland and Wellington will, on the whole, be raised, and in other smaller districts also. I think that, under this scale which is proposed, the teachers generally will be benefited. Country teachers will receive substantial assistance by having a certificated teacher to help them when the average attendance reaches 40, and the salaries will, on the whole, be generally increased. But, more particularly, it seems to me that this scale makes more adequate provision for the women teachers of the colony. I find that the women teachers of the colony may be divided roughly into two classes. First, there are the infant teachers—they may be called infant mistresses—and there are also the class teachers. I find that about the highest rates of pay are something like this, taking infant teachers first: In Wellington, £125; Otago, £155; Auckland, probably £100, but I found one or two at £120; in Canterbury, £160. There is a disparity, as you will see, of at least £35 between Wellington and Canterbury. But it is when you come to the position of class teachers—and a very large number of the women teachers of the colony are class teachers—that the greater disparity exists. I find that about the best rate of pay in Wellington for a class teacher is £100. Mr. Grundy said £90, but there is one at £100 that I know of. In Otago it is £115; in Auckland £100; in Canterbury I find that there are positions open to women—omitting altogether infant mistresses—worth up to £200. They call the women occupying these positions "departmental females." As far as I can judge women are quite as capable of doing school-work as men. For infant-work, lower standards, and middle standards of mixed schools, they are quite as capable as men, and are well able to do the whole of the work in purely girls' schools. I think if the necessity is borne in mind of having the supply of men teachers kept up in order to fill the positions of headmasters in schools of a certain size, and also assistantships in schools of a certain size, every inducement should be held out to get the best class of women to enter the teaching profession. Arrangements, too, might be made, and ought to be made, to enable women who are very strong physically, and gifted as teachers, to teach the higher classes in the mixed schools. Women teachers are well able to do the whole of the standard-work of the girls in mixed schools, if the sexes are separated, up to and including Standard IV.—and Standard V. too, when the circumstances are favourable. Under "favourable circumstances" I would include moderate size of classes, reasonable demands in the interpretation of the syllabus, suitable class-rooms, and the women themselves being physically strong; in fact, I see no reason why some women could not do the work of any mixed class up to and including Standard VII. I do not consider it is advisable that the first assistant at a large city school should be a woman, because, in the absence of a headmaster, the first assistant would naturally be called upon to do the work. Possibly, also, in very large schools it is advisable that the second assistant should be a man; but I think that in exceptional cases women might, and ought to be, allowed to occupy second assistantships. If inducements of this kind were held out, and there is room for them in the suggested scale, I believe the women teachers of the colony would receive what they have long deserved. If in a very large school, say, in one of 700 or more, an infant mistress were paid a fair remuneration, and two male assistants also received suitable salaries, I think the first female assistant, omitting the infant mistress, ought, with the supervision of the sewing, the girls' playground, and the girls' drill, to receive a salary of, at any rate, not less than £156 a year. The work that would be demanded from the first female assistant—omitting for the present the infant mistress—would give greater scope and greater opportunities to women who are now filling the position of class-teachers. As far as I can judge, this would give opportunity to two classes of women teachers—first, infant mistresses; and, second, class-teachers. There is only one thing more I wish to say—it has been mentioned more than once, but I thought I would like to say something about it—I refer to the staffing on average attendance. It seems to me that the staffing on average attendance is not fair to the staffs; I say nothing about the salaries at all. I cannot say what ought to be done in the matter, but I will

here point out that I think an injustice is done. It seems to me that some change ought to be made so that the staffing of a school would be based on something between the average attendance and the number on the roll. I would be inclined to say that it should be something from 90 to 95 per cent. of the roll-number. I could not find last year's daily register of my own school, but I found the register for the winter quarter of the year before last, and I took the weeks where, say, wet weather came in, and found how the staffing was affected by one wet day or day and a half wet. I found that in one week, taking all the days, good and bad, the average attendance was 724, and that if I omitted the wet day it went up to 765. Then I took another week ending the 16th June, and found that the average attendance was 717, and when I omitted a day or day and a half, the average went up to 759, a difference of 42. Then, for the week ending the 30th June, the average was 681, and, omitting two wet days, it went up to 750, a difference of 69. For the week ending the 26th May the average was 700, and, omitting wet days, 751, a difference of 51. For the week ending the 19th May the average was 704; omitting wet days, 739. For the week ending the 12th May, 674; omitting wet days, 716. I give these figures to show that if a school is staffed on the average attendance pure and simple, injustice is done to the children. If you take three or four days in the week when the average in a school would, say, be 800, and then if on a wet day or two wet days the average were brought down for that week or that quarter to 750, I think that the children would be taught under disadvantageous circumstances. I say nothing of the salaries of the teachers, but consider here only the interests of the scholars.

1608. *Mr. Davidson.*] You are secretary of the New Zealand Educational Institute?—Yes.

1609. You have attended the annual meetings of the Council of the Institute on frequent occasions?—Yes; consecutively, I think, for five years.

1610. At these meetings you have met representatives from every educational district in the colony?—That is so.

1611. What has been your teaching experience?—Twenty-two years and a half.

1612. Would you kindly state what positions you have filled?—I was on the relieving-staff in Victoria for a time; I filled positions in country schools there; I was afterwards assistant at Oamaru; assistant at the Caversham School in Dunedin, and headmaster of the Hokitika District High School for, I think, seven years and a half, and I have been here two years and a half.

1613. Then, your experience should enable you to answer questions on such a subject as we are considering. Do you consider there are too many pupil-teachers in several educational districts in the colony for efficient working of the schools?—Yes.

1614. Have you noted the number of pupil-teachers compared with the number of adult teachers—for instance, in Hawke's Bay?—I have not noted them minutely, but I know that the Wellington District has a very much larger proportion than Otago, which employs assistant teachers more freely.

1615. Do you know that, according to the last report of the Minister of Education, you will find that in Hawke's Bay there are ninety-four pupil-teachers, compared with 127 adult teachers?—I had not noticed that particularly.

Mr. Hill: Those figures are not correct. The ex-pupil-teachers are counted in that return.

Mr. Hogben: The return is made up from the Board's own figures, checked by the names.

1616. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you noticed that in Otago there are only eighty-two pupil-teachers to 402 adult teachers?—Yes; I did notice that there was a very small number there compared with the adult teachers.

1617. Do you find that boys, and the right class of boys, are entering the teaching service in Wellington?—No; boys have not come forward at all, in my experience, but it is limited here to two years and a half.

1618. What is your opinion as to the reasons for their not coming forward?—There are not sufficient inducements offered.

1619. Do you think that the method of selecting pupil-teachers generally throughout the colony is a good one?—I cannot say what it is like in all the other educational districts. I know what it was like in Otago and Westland, and what it is like here.

1620. Is there an entrance examination in Wellington?—No; but I think matriculated students are preferred; however, I am not certain about that.

1621. You have had some experience in teaching small country schools?—Not in this colony, but in Victoria.

1622. Do you approve of the suggested staffing of the small schools in the alternative scale?—Yes, I do.

1623. You think that the staffing is sufficient?—Yes; but I could not speak with the same authority as if I had taught country schools under this syllabus.

1624. I notice the Wellington scale of staffing allowed for your school, when the average attendance was 719, was seven adults and ten pupil-teachers: is that correct?—I suppose it is, if it is taken from the Minister's report.

1625. The suggested staffing is ten adults and seven pupil-teachers—that is, it would give you three adults in place of three pupil-teachers: would that be a stronger and more efficient staff for your class of school?—I do not think there is any doubt about that, except, perhaps, a difficulty might come in with regard to the rooms. They have been built largely for pupil-teacher staffing.

1626. At what average attendance in a large school would it be necessary to break a standard into two divisions, mixed, or one of boys and one of girls?—That depends on the staff. I have three Fourth Standards and three Third Standards. They are broken up in such a way as to give the teachers who are the farthest up the staff—the most experienced teachers—the largest number; and, if there is one, the pupil-teacher gets the smaller number.

1627. If the school is sufficiently large to break the standards, say, into two divisions, would you break them into mixed divisions, boys and girls, classified according to efficiency, altogether apart from the question of sex, or would you prefer to separate the sexes?—I would prefer to separate the sexes.

1628. Then, do you think, in that case, the average woman teacher could take any standard, provided she had to teach girls?—I do not think there is any doubt about that.

1629. You have had some experience in a school, perhaps, having an average attendance of 200—smaller than your present school?—Yes; I was at a school where the average attendance was from 220 to 280.

1630. You have also had experience as an assistant teacher in a school of between 500 and 600?—Yes; the attendance at the Caversham School was between 600 and 650.

1631. That was a mixed school?—Yes.

1632. At such a school, when it is found impossible to break the standards into two classes, do you think the average woman is physically capable of teaching and managing successfully a large class from the Fourth Standard upwards, boys and girls?—I think that Standard IV. would be a little trying, and I do not think it is fair to ask a woman to take Standard V. in a mixed school—*i.e.*, when the classes are large.

1633. Do you not think that Standard IV., in a mixed class, having an average attendance of about 60 or 70, is too great a strain for the average woman?—I could not judge so well as if I were headmaster of the school, but I think the work would be harder than it ought to be for a woman. Upper mixed classes of that size are much too large for women teachers.

1634. Do you think the average age of teachers in the Wellington District has increased during the last three years?—I am really not prepared to answer that question.

1635. The Marlborough Education Board has sent on a recommendation from the local Institute that, pending the introduction of a superannuation scheme, teachers over sixty-five years of age who wish to retire owing to ill-health should be allowed one month's salary for each year's service: do you approve of that recommendation, presuming that the money would be paid by the Government?—I do not suppose there would be any objection to that.

1636. Do you think it would be in the interests of education if teachers over sixty-five years of age were enabled to retire in that way?—I think that at sixty-five there are some men who are quite fit for work, but I do not think this would apply to the average teacher.

1637. *Mr. Stewart.*] Which do you consider to be the worst paid class of teacher in your district?—Ex-pupil-teachers.

1638. How long does the teacher remain an ex-pupil-teacher?—Till he or she can get another position.

1639. Is it correct that there are teachers in this district who have been classed as ex-pupil-teachers for seven or eight years?—I think that is so. I believe the instance that Mr. Grundy gave was correct.

1640. What is the maximum salary paid to an ex-pupil-teacher?—It was £50, but now £42 is the highest, except in the case of those who were ex-pupil-teachers before the Board made the reduction. I think that is the difference.

1641. How long do your pupil-teachers serve as pupil-teachers before their apprenticeship expires?—Four years.

1642. Then, assuming that four years indentures have to be served, six years afterwards, at the end of ten years an ex-pupil-teacher might get £50 a year?—Yes, if he or she did not take an assistantship, but remained at the school.

1643. Are you training too many pupil-teachers for the vacancies—is the supply of pupil-teachers greater than the annual waste?—Apparently so; facts seem to point that way.

1644. You have spoken in the abstract as to a colonial scale: have you seen the alternative scale?—Yes.

1645. Would that as a whole benefit the teachers of the Wellington Province?—I have not compared it with every individual salary, and am not prepared to say.

1646. Take a school of from 15 to 20: what salary would be paid to the teacher of that school under the Wellington Board's scale?—£70.

1647. What would be paid under the proposed scale?—£80.

1648. Then, we may say that altogether the teachers at all schools of up to 20 would benefit very materially under this scale?—To the extent of £10 to £30 a year. The salaries under the alternative scale would run from £80 to £100.

1649. Do you think that is a class of school (from 15 to 20) that ought to be carefully looked after in drawing up a colonial scale?—Certainly.

1650. Take the schools of from 19 to 40: what would the teachers of those schools receive under the Wellington Board's scale?—They are classified differently; the salaries increase at every additional 5 in the attendance.

1651. Take a school with an average attendance of 30: what would the teacher receive according to the Wellington Board's scale?—£100 is the maximum.

1652. What would that teacher receive under the alternative scale?—£140.

1653. Then, the teachers at that class of school would benefit very considerably?—Yes.

1654. Schools of that class are very numerous in the Wellington Province?—Yes, I think so.

1655. Take a school with an average attendance of 35: what would the teacher of such a school receive under the Wellington Board's scale?—From £135 to £155.

1656. And under the alternative scale?—£150.

1657. Those small schools are the most numerous class in the Wellington Province?—Yes.

1658. And the teachers at them would benefit very materially under the alternative scale?—Yes.

1659. Do you consider that the maximum salary at present paid in the Wellington Province is sufficiently large to act as a stimulus to those engaged in the profession?—Not compared with other professions.

1660. Would the maximum salary under the proposed scale be of any benefit in that direction: would it act as a stimulus to the teachers of Wellington?—I certainly think so; it would be a benefit in this direction: that it would induce a better class of persons to go in for teaching, because the inducement would be higher.

1661. Do you think the system of appointment of pupil-teachers in the Wellington District a satisfactory one?—No; I should certainly like to see a change.

1662. In what direction?—The headmaster and the Inspector should both have more say in the appointment of teachers.

1663. Has the Inspector any voice at present?—I cannot say.

1664. Does he visit the school to see the candidate?—He may report to the Board, for all I know.

1665. Do the Inspectors see the candidates teach before they are employed?—They certainly have not done so at the Newtown School.

1666. Then, how does the Board know whether candidates can teach or not?—I cannot answer that question.

1667. Are any reasonable methods taken of finding out whether a candidate for a pupil-teachership has teaching ability or not?—I cannot say.

1668. Do you know of any?—No.

1669. Is there any entrance examination for pupil-teachers?—No.

1670. Do you think there ought to be one?—I do; I have said before, and I still think, that matriculated candidates should have the preference.

1671. If there were an examination here, the Board might either take the matriculated examination or have an entrance examination of its own?—Yes.

1672. That would be more satisfactory?—Yes.

1673. Do you think that under the present state of affairs throughout New Zealand a teacher has sufficient security as to what his income is to be from year to year?—No.

1674. Do you think a colonial scale would give greater security?—Yes, I do.

1675. Is it your opinion that a statutory provision for teachers' salaries must have more permanence than a Board's scale?—Yes, I think so.

1676. Do you think that in drawing up a colonial scale the Commission ought to consider carefully whether a residence is attached to a school or not?—Most decidedly.

1677. You have seen a copy of the first proposed scale?—Yes.

1678. Did you see a note on page 3 with regard to house allowance?—Yes; I noticed that particularly.

1679. Do you think it a right and just thing that, where a house is not provided, the house allowance shall be made from the Building Fund, as a charge on that fund, rather than on the Incidental Fund?—Yes, because existing houses, I presume, have been erected out of the Building Fund.

1680. Have you the records of the New Zealand Educational Institute?—Yes, for all the past years.

1681. I would like you to refer to the last Nelson and Christchurch meetings, because specific statements have been made with regard to these meetings. The Christchurch one was held in 1899: will you see if there is any record of a resolution having been tabled at that meeting in reference to the abolition of Boards and the centralisation of the system?—The only resolution bearing on centralising that I can find is in reference to the Inspectors.

1682. Would you mind looking up the records of the Nelson meeting, held in 1894, I think: is there any record of a resolution having been tabled or discussed with regard to the centralisation of the whole system under the department?—No; nothing beyond the centralising of the Inspectors.

1683. Then, if it has been stated to this Commission that the Council of the Educational Institute had decided in favour of the abolition of Boards and the centralisation of the system, such evidence must have been given under a misapprehension?—I certainly think so. I can find no record of such decision having been arrived at by the Council of the Institute.

1684. *Mr. Luke.*] With reference to the question of equal pay for equal work, as far as male and female teachers are concerned, would you mind giving your views on that matter?—I suppose that theoretically no one can say that there ought to be anything but equal pay for equal work, but my position is this: Rightly or wrongly, the various Education Boards and School Committees, and, I dare say, the public of a district, prefer that men filling certain positions should be married men. Women may fill these positions and not be married; but it is expected that a man, to undertake a particular class of work, should be a married man, and therefore incur extra responsibility. I think he should receive extra remuneration for that reason. That is not the only reason that I have, but in my judgment it is a very strong one. I may say that when I left a school that I was at the man who took my position got the appointment on the understanding that he was going to be married.

1685. You do not advance as a reason why women should not receive equal pay to men that women break down sooner than men?—No, not at all.

1686. What did you mean when you referred to "a better class entering the teaching profession"?—The higher the inducements that are offered in the way of additional remuneration the better the class that will be drawn into the profession.

1687. As a rule, do not the most intellectual boys and girls enter the teaching profession now?—I would not like to say that; it would reflect on other professions; but I do not think we get the best of them.

1688. Would you interfere at all with the functions of Education Boards?—Certainly not; I see no reason for doing that.

1689. *Mr. Hill.*] Were all the educational districts represented when the New Zealand Educational Institute passed resolutions approving of a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes; every one of them. Not every year, but they certainly were at the last meeting.

1690. Were any lady representatives present?—Yes; at Timaru one lady was present. At the Wellington meeting four were present.

1691. Was it recognised that under a colonial scale men and women should receive the same salary?—I do not think that matter came forward.

1692. Do you think the Institute would be likely to approve of such a proposal?—I could not answer for the Institute as a whole.

1693. You recognise, of course, that under a colonial scale some of the education districts would suffer to a large extent?—I do not know that that is so.

1694. On a £4 capitation some districts would have a great deal more given to them than others?—Do you mean if the money is to be voted to the Boards without a colonial scale?

1695. Would each district receive £4 capitation grant under a colonial scale, the same amount as it would receive on an ordinary Education Board basis, such as the present basis?—No.

1696. Some districts would evidently lose?—Yes; those that have a large number of schools from which profit is made.

1697. It would be drawn to the smaller districts?—Yes.

1698. Have you estimated whether this district would be likely to have some money withdrawn on a £4 capitation?—No.

1699. The Institute has not considered that aspect of the question?—I have never heard it discussed.

1700. You have not taken the thirteen districts and estimated how much each one would gain or lose under the proposed scale?—No, I have not; nor have I heard any one state what the result would be.

1701. Suppose that the proposed scale were adopted with the certification here shown, do you think it would be likely to affect the interests of teachers who have lower certificates than those required under the proposed scale?—Yes.

1702. Assuming this proposed scale were adopted, and along with it there was a safeguarding for a period of four years of the interests of teachers who did not hold the required certificates, do you think that the adoption of the scale would benefit those teachers?—I would rather answer that in another way; I would rather say that I think the certificates asked for in the proposed scale are higher than is really necessary.

1703. Suppose the salary which a teacher is receiving at the present time is higher than the salary which he or she would receive under this proposed scale, do you think that it is fair to safeguard the interests of that teacher for a period of four, or five, or six years, as the case may be, in order to prevent hardship?—Yes; I think that should be done.

1704. Then, you think that all the teachers in New Zealand who would be affected for the worse by a scale of this kind should be safeguarded for a period?—I would say "No" and "Yes" to that question. It seems to me that the teachers who are above the scale might be reduced in a given time by a sliding-scale.

1705. You think that the teachers below the scale should be raised at once?—Certainly.

1706. And for how long do you think the teachers who are above the scale should remain so?—They should be brought to scale within, say, four years.

1707. And do you think that would be a fair thing to do?—I think so.

1708. You do not think an injustice would be done to teachers in cases like that?—No, not in the long-run. There must be cases of hardship under any scale.

1709. There are several Education Boards that have set their faces for a long time against the opening of small schools?—Yes.

1710. Do you think that if they are aware that Government intends to sustain those schools, and are allowed to continue the control as to the opening of such schools, they will adopt a plan such as has been adopted in some education districts—that is, of opening a school wherever there is a pupil, or two or three pupils? Is it possible that Education Boards throughout the colony will follow that plan? Do you not think they will naturally say, "The Government will maintain these schools, there is no responsibility with us, so we will open them"?—I think they have got too much sense and judgment to do anything of that kind.

1711. But if they find there are children to be educated, do you not think they will say, "The Government gives £5 capitation, so we will give these children a chance of being educated"? Do you not think they would do a thing like that?—If they thought it necessary in the interests of the district they might.

1712. Exactly. Does that not open the door for an increase of the £5 capitation which cannot be estimated? You cannot estimate how much money will be required for such schools if the power is in the hands of an Education Board, and the Government have to pay whenever the power is exercised by that Board?—Do you mean this: that if you allowed Boards to open schools for a less number of children than is provided for in this scale the Education Boards might, to some extent, paralyse the central department?

1713. Yes. There is only £4 capitation allowed, and if £5 is spent, and can be spent at the will of an Education Board, is that not likely to cause difficulty in regard to the amount available for providing for these schools?—Not any very great inconvenience.

1714. With regard to the training of pupil-teachers, you recognise that there are defects in our present system?—Certainly.

1715. And that it is advisable that some special means should be taken to improve the status of pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1716. Would you suggest any course other than the present—that is, in the first training of pupil-teachers, or the first training of probationers, if you like? Would you suggest that they should have a training anticipatory to becoming teachers in the schools—that they should be allowed to have the benefit of a special teacher, who should train them in methods, and the reasons for such methods, before they are admitted as part of the staff of a public school?—I think, if they were placed on the staff as probationers for a year, the Inspector and the headmaster of the school ought to be able to judge whether a particular boy or girl had a certain aptitude for the work.

1717. In such a case would you propose to pay them for the work they do?—I think so.

1718. What would a probationer be likely to do the first year?—Exactly the same as a pupil-teacher of the first year.

1719. Is it not a fact that many of the pupil-teachers who are sent into the schools are ill-prepared for the work they are called upon to do?—That is a great defect in the pupil-teacher system. I think it would be a good thing if we had no pupil-teacher system at all—*i.e.*, unskilled teachers in charge of classes. If possible, it would be much better if there were only adult teachers in the schools.

1720. Has your Institute never considered such an important and vital question?—Not, I think, in that form.

1721. Have they made any suggestion at any time in respect to the employment of pupil-teachers?—They have in regard to the training of pupil-teachers. I remember the question came up in regard to the proportion of adult teachers to pupil-teachers.

1722. Will you look it up?—Yes. At the meeting of the Institute at Timaru in 1900 the record is as follows: "It was resolved that the Council affirms the need for better provision being made for the training of teachers throughout the colony." The resolution carried at the meeting in Wellington last year was as follows: "That the Council urge upon the Government the necessity of making more adequate provision for the training of teachers."

1723. What is about the percentage of average attendance at your school compared with the number on the roll?—For the last quarter the average attendance was nearly 86 per cent. of the roll-number.

1724. Now, could you tell me what was the highest number present on any day?—814 was the highest attendance out of a roll-number of 916.

1725. What was the average for that week?—774.

1726. Your average attendance that week was 774 out of 916 on the roll. Could you now tell me how many pupils were instructed during that week?—I could not tell you that; there might have been some present one day and absent another.

1727. Still, that was the highest number present?—It would not show the total number present.

1728. But the highest number present on any one day in that particular week was 814?—Yes.

1729. This 814 actually came under instruction at your school?—Yes.

1730. What I want to ask is this: assuming that your teachers are paid on a capitation allowance, do you think they ought to be paid on the 774, the average number, or on 814, the highest number present at your school under instruction at any time during the week?—I think that more important than the payment of teachers is the adequate staffing of the school. I consider the school is inadequately staffed when staffed on the average attendance. I say that in the interest of the children.

1731. But the staffing depends upon the amount available for distribution, and that amount is paid on the 774, and not on the 814?—Quite so.

1732. If you were to take the highest number present at all, week by week, for a quarter, and divide by the number of weeks in that quarter, that would give you the average of the highest number present at all at your school?—Yes, I think so.

1733. Do you think, in the interests of your school, in the interests of staffing, that your school should be staffed on the average attendance or on the average of the highest number present at all during each week of a quarter?—On the higher number. I said in my opening statement that I believed that the number on which the schools should be staffed should be from 90 to 95 per cent. of the roll-number.

1734. If capitation were paid on the higher number, would the staffing at your school be improved materially?—Yes; I showed that before.

1735. It would enable some time to be given to the training of pupil-teachers, by the appointment of more efficient teachers?—Yes.

1736. Has your Institute ever considered such a question as that?—No, I do not think it has. It has considered the question of average attendance, but I believe it was in the form of asking that certain days shall be excluded. I will read the resolution which was carried on the subject: "It was resolved, That when the attendance at any school is reduced below 70 per cent. of the roll-number during any quarter by epidemics, staff and salary be reckoned according to the same percentage of the roll as was maintained during the corresponding quarter of the previous year."

1737. I understand that your Institute fully recognises the desirability of a colonial scale?—Yes.

1738. Have they in any way suggested the desirability of a colonial system of promotion?—I think that has not been discussed at all.

1739. The question has not been discussed in any way?—No; because it would involve the abolition of the Boards.

1740. Your Institute is not in favour of the abolition of the Boards?—Not as far as I can judge.

1741. Has your Institute made any recommendation as to the abolition of School Committees?—No, I think not.

1742. Have they made any recommendation as to the granting of the right to Education Boards to remove teachers from school to school if found desirable?—I do not think that has been discussed either. I believe that the transferring of teachers within the same educational district was discussed, but I cannot say whether anything was carried or not.

1743. Do you think that all the certificated teachers on the staff of a large school should be required to assist in the training and instruction of pupil-teachers?—That should be in the hands of the headmaster.

1744. Would it not be better for different teachers to take special subjects?—That depends entirely upon circumstances. I have no doubt that the headmaster, under certain circumstances, might deem it advisable to get the assistance of certain members of his staff, but that would depend so much on circumstances that it should not be laid down as a rule that the members of the staff should help in the instruction of pupil-teachers.

1745. But if the headmaster thought it desirable?—I think he ought to be allowed to adopt the plan of getting the teachers to help in the instruction of pupil-teachers if he found it desirable.

1746. *Mr. Smith.*] Your staff at the end of 1899, according to the Minister's report, consisted of eight adults and fifteen pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1747. You said just now you thought it would be very desirable to do without pupil-teachers if possible: do you think that under the present scale you could conduct your school satisfactorily if you had one adult teacher for every two pupil-teachers?—Where I would find the greatest difficulty, if pupil-teachers were excluded, would possibly be in breaking up small classes in the infant-room for kindergarten work.

1748. The expense would be very much greater?—Yes; it would be an exceedingly expensive system.

1749. *Mr. Weston.*] I understood that you disapprove of the pupil-teacher system?—Yes; as a system.

1750. Will you kindly give me, in a few words, your reason for saying so?—As a general rule, the pupil-teachers are asked to do that class of work which is really the most difficult of all; they are asked to do it, I suppose, for the simple and obvious reason that they are able to govern and control little children, whereas they are unable to control the upper classes. If they were able to control the upper classes, the best place to put them would be higher up in the school; but, as they can manage the little children better, they are put just exactly where they ought not to be, for they have not the requisite skill to deal with little children.

1751. What you mean is this: that the infant classes require special and trained teachers to lay a good foundation for the school?—I think that goes without saying.

1752. Have the pupil-teachers sufficient time to pursue their studies to advantage under the present system?—I believe it is unjust that they should be asked to teach, and pursue their studies out of school-hours.

1753. What would you advocate, then, as a remedy for the existing evil?—I presume that the pupil-teacher system cannot be abolished yet, and, assuming it is to remain, I think the only way out of the difficulty is to ask the pupil-teachers to do a certain amount of teaching in school, the rest of the time to be devoted to their own studies.

1754. Then, I understand that you regard pupil-teaching in the higher standards as a failure?—I do not think the pupil-teachers should teach the higher standards.

1755. If pupil-teachers are not suited for the lower standards, and are not much good in the higher standards (you said they were unable to control the older children), of what use are they at all in a school?—We have to do the best we can, and we put them in the infant-room simply because they are able to do the mechanical part of the work there.

1756. Now, in regard to the training of pupil-teachers, you say that in your opinion there should be a uniform system of training them?—Yes.

1757. Do you believe in a uniform system of teaching throughout the colony?—No, certainly not; I think a great deal will depend on a man or woman's own personality.

1758. If you have a uniform system of pupil-teacher training, will you not, at all events indirectly, if not directly, contribute to a uniform system of teaching throughout the colony?—Not necessarily, unless you kill the individuality of the men and women who are doing the work.

1759. If you train teachers in one particular way, will it not follow that to a large extent the children must be trained in one system of uniformity?—No, I think not.

1760. Then, do I understand you to mean that there should not be uniformity of system throughout the colony?—Uniformity of what kind?

1761. Uniformity of methods, syllabus, style, and everything connected with teaching?—No; I certainly would not go so far as that; but I think pupil-teachers ought to have a uniform system; that there ought to be a certain entrance examination; and that there ought to be a certain literary course of study mapped out for them. That can be done with a great deal of variety.

1762. If there were pupil-teacher regulations applicable to the whole of the colony, it would be a departmental matter, would it not; the Boards would have no control at all?—Yes, they would.

1763. What control would they have?—Exactly the same as under the Inspectors just now.

1764. Do you mean that each Board should prepare its own regulations for the training and examination of pupil-teachers?—No.

1765. Then, what do you mean by a uniform system?—I mean that the regulations should be on very much the same lines as the syllabus that is laid down now for classes.

1766. Am I to understand you to mean that there should be one system of training for pupil-teachers throughout the colony?—Yes.

1767. Then, who is to establish the system—the Boards of the various districts, or the Education Department at Wellington?—It could come from the central department, and the carrying-out of it should be in the hands of the Boards and their Inspectors.

1768. Do you mean that the questions submitted to the pupil-teachers at their examinations should emanate from the central department?—I think that is done in Wellington already.

1769. You say the uniform system must emanate from Wellington: must not that tend to a dead uniformity amongst all pupil-teachers in our colony?—I do not think so.

1770. Do you believe in a uniform system of education for all the children in the colony?—Yes; uniform, but allowing room for the individual characteristics of the several teachers.

1771. If you think that pupil-teachers are a failure——?—Pardon me, I did not say that; I said they were often asked to do the class of work which they ought not to be asked to do.

1772. You said that, if you had your way, there would be no pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1773. Then, must we not infer from that that you regard pupil-teachers as a failure? What would you desire to be done to make them a success?—I should not want any at all if we could possibly staff the school with assistants.

1774. If you do not believe in pupil-teachers, how would you manufacture teachers?—By putting the candidates through a training-college.

1775. From what class would you gather the boys and girls to send them to these training-colleges?—We could have an entrance examination for the college, and those who had been through the high school would possibly form the largest number from whom the training-college would be recruited.

1776. Do you not think that if a man obtained a certificate as a teacher as a man obtains a certificate as a lawyer he should be allowed to work out his own salvation, and that the Committees and Boards should be allowed to select their own men without having regard to more than the original certificate?—I am in favour of two certificates. I would make the first one about as difficult as what is called the E certificate. I think that would be sufficient for teachers of very small schools. The other one I would make higher than the matriculation examination, so that the teacher would be able to train his own pupil-teachers up to that point.

1777. And then you would let him either go down or work up, according to his merits?—Certainly.

1778. Supposing, however, a man was valued according to his certificate, should not the opposite position be considered—that is to say, that if a man's mental powers declined he should be reduced in his certificate? For instance, if a man were paid according to his certificate, would it not be necessary to revise that certificate from time to time, so that he should be judged upon his merits?—I am not in favour of doing that.

1779. You do not think that that is the logical conclusion?—I think that if his work were unsatisfactory he would soon be shifted to another position, or lose the one he had.

1780. Do you think that if the suggested scale of staffing were adopted there would be necessity for alterations in the class-rooms at the schools?—Certainly.

1781. For instance, at your own school, would your class-rooms have to be altered?—Certainly.

1782. Would that involve much expense?—I could not tell you, but I know the school has been built largely on a pupil-teacher basis.

1783. And I suppose we may assume that if that difficulty existed at your own school it would apply to many others?—I could not tell you that.

1784. With regard to the appointment of teachers, do you approve of the Committees having a voice in the appointment, removal, and dismissal of teachers?—Yes.

1785. So that the present system of appointment you think is sufficiently good?—I would not like to say that, because it is not the same under the various Boards. The Wellington Board does not leave to the Committees the same amount of power in the choice of a teacher as some Education Boards do, where they send on a large number of names to the Committee.

1786. What system do you think should be followed in the appointment of teachers?—That is rather a large order, and I do not know that I can fill it. I should think that, at any rate, a fair amount of power in the selection and removal of teachers should be left in the hands of the Boards; I think they are the best judges. They are certainly in possession of most information in regard to the quality and character of the work.

1787. I suppose you would advocate reference being made to the Inspectors?—I think that should be done in every case.

1788. With regard to lady teachers, do you think that in small schools lady teachers should receive the same pay as male teachers?—Yes; in very small schools. The salary is so small that I think there ought to be no differentiation.

1789. What do you think should be the minimum salary for male and lady teachers?—I do not think a woman ought to be asked to work for less than £100, nor a man for less than £110.

1790. Do you think that a lady teacher would be competent to take all the standards in a country school up to 40 children?—I should think so, but I cannot judge of country-school work.

1791. What is your idea in regard to sick-pay allowance?—I think that the treatment of teachers by the Wellington Board is fairly liberal. I think that where a teacher is away he or she gets a month's full pay before a reduction takes place.

1792. And do you think that sufficient?—I think that in the long-run that is a reasonable consideration.

1793. *Mr. Hogben.*] I understood you to say that some districts would lose under this colonial scale: can you tell me which districts would lose?—I meant many teachers; I did not mean the district as a whole.

1794. The districts now are being paid capitation on a £3 15s. basis?—Yes.

1795. You do not mean that any one of them would get less under this proposed distribution than they are now getting on the £3 15s. basis?—I have not computed it, but I do not think they would.

1796. It is obvious that some would get less than £4 a head if others got more than £4?—Yes.

1797. You have not worked it out to see how much more than the £4 some would get, and how much less others would get?—No.

1798. It was hinted that the department might be placed in financial difficulties if the amount of capitation paid to small schools made the total amount exceed £4 a head throughout the colony. I suppose you understand that one way of introducing a colonial scale, if the Commission recommend any, would be that a Bill should be passed by Parliament to make that colonial scale a part of the law of the land, in the same way as the £3 15s. capitation is now the law of the land. In that case the amount that was made statutory would be payable on that statutory authority in the same way as the £3 15s. is payable now?—I should say that would be so.

1799. As a matter of fact, Parliament votes enough to pay the £3 15s. capitation?—Yes.

1800. And would vote the amount required under a colonial scale in the same way?—Yes, if a colonial scale were introduced.

1801. The only way in which Parliament could interfere with the amount would be by repealing the statute?—Yes.

1802. In that case, if Parliament voted the money, the department could not be involved in financial difficulties any more than it could now; it might underestimate what is payable now on the £3 15s. basis, might it not?—Yes.

1803. It might underestimate the amount payable under a colonial scale in the same way, might it not?—I think Mr. Hill was referring to schools of under 14, which do not come under the scale.

1804. They are under the scale. If you look at it you will see there is a note to the effect that aided schools of from 1 to 14 receive capitation at the rate of £5 a head?—Yes.

1805. Therefore the difficulty would be the same as at present; there would be no other difficulty than that which exists at the present time. It would be simply a matter of how much was estimated to be payable during the year?—Yes.

1806. Once a scale is adopted, the estimate for the year will have to be framed on the amount payable to the schools according to that scale, will it not?—Yes.

1807. Not on the £4 basis?—I understood that Mr. Hill's point was that we might have a very large number of schools drawing capitation at £5, which would take very materially from those that were drawing on an average £4 all round.

1808. But, supposing a scale were constructed on a £4 basis originally, as soon as it was adopted the £4 basis would disappear—the scale would be the basis of estimate in the future?—Does the £4 element drop out?

1809. There cannot be two elements in it; the £4 must drop out. The scale after that necessarily becomes the basis of estimate?—Yes.

1810. And therefore it is only a question of whether the scale will work too expensively or not—a question for the representatives of the people. I will put it in another way: Supposing that a colonial scale were adopted to include all schools, even the schools under 14, the department's estimate for the year of what was payable for primary education would depend simply on the number of teachers in the schools, and the scale, without any reference to the £4 capitation at all?—Yes.

1811. The amount payable then might increase, but so would the estimate increase as the number increased, so that it could not in any given year land the department in financial difficulty: as the schools increased year by year the department would increase its estimate?—I think Mr. Hill's point was that if there were a very large number of children who were drawing £5 a head, that would to an extent take away what was available for the schools above 15.

1812. But once a scale was adopted, would not the £4 basis disappear?—Then there could be no difficulty about it at all.

1813. As long as the money is provided?—Quite so.

1814. You think there should be some safeguard against the multiplication of small schools?—I think the Boards would exercise sufficient judgment in that matter.

1815. The discretion of the Boards would be a sufficient safeguard?—I think so.

1816. But do you not think there might be a temptation, on the part of some districts possibly, to elect new members of Boards who would be favourable to the multiplication of small schools, even though the present Boards might be against it?—There might be.

1817. Then, do you not think there should be a safeguard in this way: that a new school should not be established within a certain distance of one already in existence?—I think if it were necessary to introduce a safeguard it should be on the basis of distance of one school from another.

1818. What do you think of the safeguard of a minimum salary—that is to say, that if a capitation of £5 be granted the inhabitants concerned should be required to contribute towards the salary, so that it should come up to a certain standard?—I think that in some cases that might fall rather heavily on settlers, who would possibly have quite enough to do under existing circumstances to keep themselves; that is where the difficulty might come in. I recognise that the children of the struggling settlers ought to get all the advantages of education. I know very little about back-block settlements, but I can quite understand that people who are making homes for themselves, if asked to contribute towards the salary of school-teachers, would be unable to do so in many cases.

1819. What minimum salary should a teacher be paid at a very small school?—I do not think any one ought to have less than £80.

1820. Ten pupils at £5 a head would give £50: would you establish schools where the attendance was less than 10?—No; I think it would be better to have half-time schools in a great many cases.

1821. If it were not possible to establish half-time schools, would you establish schools when the attendance was lower than 10 pupils?—I have not thought it out.

1822. Mr. Hill asked you one or two questions as to calculating average attendance: does not the highest number present at all during the quarter consist of the roll-number, *minus* the number of those absent the whole quarter?—It does not present itself to me in that way. But what I asked was that the staffing should be based on from 90 to 95 per cent. of the roll-number.

1823. With regard to the training of pupil-teachers, do I understand that you would prefer that, instead of the pupil-teacher system, candidates for the teaching profession should be admitted, say, as probationers to training-colleges?—I should prefer that. At the expiration of their training-college experience they should be fully certificated teachers—juniors, if you like to call them so.

1824. You would give them some period of probation?—Yes.

1825. And with that safeguard you would prefer that system to the pupil-teacher system?—Yes.

1826. The only objection to that system that you can see is the cost?—That is all.

1827. When you say you would prefer a uniform system of training pupil-teachers, you mean by that that you would prefer to have uniform examinations for pupil-teachers at the end of their several years?—Yes.

1828. Pupil-teachers in all districts are supposed to end their term by gaining a teachers' certificate—an E or a D—are they not?—They do, I think, in a number of districts.

1829. The D and the E examinations do not vary in the different districts in the colony?—No.

1830. There is uniform examination at the end of their course?—Yes.

1831. The regulations for pupil-teachers' examinations have to be approved by the Minister as well as by the several Boards, is not that so?—Yes, I think it is.

1832. At present they originate from the Board?—Yes, instead of originating from the department.

1833. The method of examination for chemists, solicitors, and doctors is the same over all parts of the colony, is it not?—Yes.

1834. And you wish to see teachers placed in the same position?—Yes.

1835. You do not wish to see uniformity in the teaching of them?—Not at all.

1836. *The Chairman.*] If training-colleges are to be established, as has been suggested, where do you think they should be established?—In the four centres.

1837. And before pupil-teachers were placed at schools at all you think they ought to be trained there?—Yes.

1838. What term of training do you think would be required at a training-college?—At least two years.

1839. There are now a number of clever girls and boys who are in employment, some of them as probationers, some as pupil-teachers in different parts of this district; some of them are the sons and daughters of poor people, and, small as the salary is, it is a great help to the household: what effect do you think the introduction of such a system as that which you advocate would have on these families and on the schools where these pupil-teachers or probationers are doing useful work?—I would not introduce it at once; to do so would certainly involve hardship in many cases.

1840. You would introduce it by degrees?—Yes; I would not interfere with the present occupants of positions.

1841. Do you think that the children, for instance, of our settlers, some of whom are naturally quite as clever as the children found in the four large centres, would be able to take advantage of these training-colleges?—I do not see why they should not.

1842. Take the case of the working-man in the country: would he be able to support his child while that child was undergoing education in a training-college in, say, Wellington?—Yes, I think if you had a training-school system that certainly would not be an obstacle.

1843. But do you not think there would be difficulties of a pecuniary nature? Do you think that the average worker or the small settler in the country would be able to maintain his boy or girl while he or she was undergoing an apprenticeship in a training-college for two years?—In Victoria they had a training system which I went through. I received an income the first year, when I was in what was known as an "associated school," of over £100, though I was not a pupil-teacher at all. I was what was called a paid pupil in training. At the expiration of my first year I passed an examination and went on to the central training institution, Melbourne. I had to keep myself that year, but at the expiration of the two years I held a trained teacher's certificate. The remuneration I got by passing the entrance examination was sufficient to maintain me for the two years.

1844. The method you suggest is one by which the pupil-teachers, during their period of training, would be amply provided for?—Yes; it was certainty so in my case.

1845. They would do a certain amount of useful work and be remunerated in return?—Yes; in Victoria we had to teach.

1846. Now, supposing such a system were adopted, what method would you recommend for preventing such a thing as an excess in the number of teachers: you see it is stated now that there are too many pupil-teachers, which is leading to a lot of hardship: how would you limit the supply?—It could be done by competitive examination.

1847. Would you have a system of competitive examination, after the candidates have been through the training-college, and before they received their certificates?—There certainly ought to be a competitive examination, so that the best men and women may be known by the results.

1848. You think that for the teaching profession there should be a competitive examination, the same as there is for the Civil Service?—Yes.

1849. With regard to male and female teachers, do you think it would be a wise thing to introduce any system by which one particular sex only should be allowed to teach certain standards: should female teachers in a mixed school be prevented from teaching, say, the Fifth, Sixth, or Seventh Standards, if capable?—Not at all. I think that provision should be made so that where, in the judgment of the Inspector and the headmaster of the school, a particular woman is capable of doing any work in that school, she should be allowed to do it.

1850. In that case, what do you think should be the difference between the salary paid to the female and the salary paid to the male teachers?—I do not think that any woman ought to be first assistant in a mixed school, for the reason that, as I stated before, in the absence of the headmaster, the first assistant would be called upon to take his place, and it is consequently desirable that the first assistant should be a man. In large schools I think the second assistant also should be a man in most cases. At a school like my own, with an average of over 700, I should certainly say that the woman in charge of the Fifth Standard girls, with the supervision of the sewing and the playground, and the arrangement of the girls' drill, should receive a salary of certainly not less than £150 a year.

1851. You say that the Fifth Standard at your school at the present time is taught by a lady?—Half of it: the boys are taught by a man and the girls by a woman.

1852. What does the male teacher, who teaches the Fifth Standard boys at your school, receive?—£100, and the lady teacher gets £100, too.

1853. Coming to the Fourth Standard: have you two teachers there?—There are three; the Fourth is taught by two assistants and an ex-pupil-teacher.

1854. How are those two assistants paid?—One gets £90 and the other, I think, £80. I arranged the classes in such a way that the teacher who gets the larger salary has the larger number of children.

1855. Into how many classes is the Third Standard divided at your school?—Into three parts, taught by three ex-pupil-teachers.

1856. How much are they paid?—£42 a year each.

1857. Is that standard as large as the Fourth?—Not quite. The numbers in the three Fourth Standard classes are 47, 44, and 39; in the three Third Standard classes the numbers are 39, 39, and 37.

1858. I suppose that the work in the Third Standard is just about as severe as the work in the Fourth?—Not quite so hard; the children are younger, and the strain in the way of discipline is not so great. Then, in Standard IV., the demands under the syllabus are greater than in Standard III.

1859. Is there such a difference as to warrant the payment of double the salaries in the one case that are paid to the other?—No; but I could not split the Fourth into two sections, because no room would hold those sections; if the number of pupils were somewhat less, I would be able to divide the standard into two parts. The present arrangement suits the rooms and the staffing.

TUESDAY, 25TH JUNE, 1901.

CHARLES R. JOPLIN, Headmaster of the Wadestown School, examined.

Mr. Joplin: My experience as a teacher extends over a long period. I think I have been teaching since the year 1877 under the Wellington Education Board, excepting for about four years. I have visited some of the largest schools in England, and concluded that there was not much to learn from them. As to my own experience: I began as a teacher on a very small scale at the Korokoro School, about two miles from Petone. I was there nearly four years. I consider that the teacher of the present day, as compared with the teacher of twenty years ago, has a very easy time. For instance, there are now excellent text-books and notes of lessons. From Korokoro I went to the Lower Hutt, and was first assistant in that school for about fourteen months. It was easier work as first assistant there than being in charge of a country school with about 26 children. I was single when teaching at the Lower Hutt, and was receiving about £150 a year. I paid about 15s. a week for board and lodging, and had the rest as pocket-money. Subsequently I applied for the Petone School, and, being appointed, I remained for nearly five years, experiencing all the difficulties of carrying on a growing school with a minimum staff. The school grew rapidly owing to two causes—the growth of the Gear Meat Company and the Woollen Factory. One of my greatest difficulties was that, though the school grew so rapidly, the teaching staff was not increased correspondingly. It is always the growing school that is the most difficult to manage. In 1886 I resigned and went to England, returning to New Zealand in 1892. During that time I became fairly well acquainted with the English educational system. Coming out again to New Zealand in 1892 I applied to the Wellington Education Board for an appointment, and was ultimately successful, being appointed to a school at Tenui. In 1894 I was appointed to Mauriceville West, a Scandinavian settlement. That school might be called a boys' school, for out of about 75 on the roll there were only 20 girls. It is a remarkable thing about a Scandinavian settlement that most of the children are boys. I stayed there about six years, and for family reasons asked for a transfer and was appointed to the Wadestown School about three months ago. I cannot say that I was promoted. My experience leads me to the conclusion that the town schools and the town teachers are much better off than the country schools and teachers. One of the greatest defects in the New Zealand educational system is the lack of inducement to young men to enter

the teaching profession. Men teaching in the country, in the backwoods, are doing noble work for miserable pay. Now-a-days it seems to me that everything is resolving itself into a matter of £ s. d. It is the case everywhere, and with every profession. Not only has the country teacher to endure peculiar hardships, but in many cases he is cut off from communication with his fellows, and has to undergo so many peculiar disabilities that he (or she) deserves much better remuneration. All teachers so situated will be pleased that the Commission has been set up, and hope that their labours will result in placing them on a more satisfactory footing. I do not say that the country teachers have been neglected by the Education Boards. To a great extent the hardships of country teachers are unavoidable, but their salaries are quite out of keeping with the important services they render. It remains for the Commission and the Government to see if anything can be done in this important matter. The cost of living in the country—I speak from long experience—is greater than in town. Whilst at the Korokoro School I received about £130 a year, the average attendance being about 26. I was then single and found the salary sufficient; but imagine my great surprise on receiving a communication from the secretary of the Board intimating that I had been receiving a salary in excess of what I was entitled to, and so some money was deducted! I had lived up to every penny of my own, and I naturally found it rather hard to be asked to refund this money. Then, at the Lower Hutt, I got £150, and had two standards to teach. I had no Committee to bother me, no irate ladies making inquiries. Being only an assistant I had nothing to do with those things. All such trouble and responsibility usually falls upon the headmaster, and after my experience I say that assistants have comparatively little to complain of. My experience in the Old Country made me look at the educational system in New Zealand in a new light. In England (I am referring to twelve or thirteen years ago) I found that our Standard VI. was equivalent to the English Standard VII. I found, too, that the salary paid in England to teachers was not equivalent to the salary paid in New Zealand. I found, further, that the cost of living was cheaper in England than in New Zealand. As far as my observation went our Inspectors compared very favourably with the Inspectors at Home. Whilst I was managing an evening continuation school in England I noticed that one Inspector occasionally invited the teachers to his house. I do not say that that should be the rule here; but his contention was that in this way he got more into touch with the teachers, and learned more of their difficulties. During my stay in England I applied to three different Education Boards for employment, but my applications were rejected on the ground that New Zealand certificates could not be recognised in England. I mention this because I consider that steps should be taken to secure reciprocal recognition of teachers as between England and New Zealand. I thoroughly believe in the principle of equal pay for equal work. Lady teachers should certainly be better paid. Whilst at Capetown I met a young Scotch lady who had been teaching in Cape Colony, and her conversation convinced me that female teachers can hold their own fairly well, despite hardships. This lady, about twenty-six years of age, said she had been teaching in Northern Cape Colony, among the Dutch and the Kaffirs. I forget what her salary was, but I know she said that the climate was abominable, and the insects terrible. I asked her how she came to such a place, and she told me that a School Inspector had represented to her that there was a splendid opening for teachers in that country. She came on with us to New Zealand, and went to Auckland, and if the Auckland Board employed her they will have a well qualified and experienced teacher. On returning to Wellington in 1892, I could not believe that I was in the same place I had left a few years before. The city had altered so much that I thought, if Wellington had made such progress, the capitation for schools must have increased proportionately. I was disappointed to find that it was not so. Reverting to equal pay for equal work, I think the female teachers are quite entitled to equal pay when they do the same work as men. In many instances females are our educational equals. They hold University degrees, they enter the legal and the medical professions, and I find, moreover, that women have business tact such as, I am sorry to say, is not always found in men. It has been said by some witnesses that women could teach very well up to the Fourth Standard. It had also been said that that standard is the most difficult. Then, if so, surely women could take the Fifth and Sixth Standards. Then, as to the ability of lady teachers to maintain discipline, I know of lady teachers who are quite competent to take charge of boys and girls in any standard. I know of one particular instance of a lady teacher whose discipline was excellent. When I was in Wellington on two occasions, two years ago, my pupil-teacher, a young lady, took charge of the school, and, though there were boys in that school who could give her a head in height, she managed the school excellently. They say that pupil-teachers do not get married; well, we have an Inspector who is not married. Many of our male teachers are not married. I do not say that young ladies are able to look after boys in their sports, nor could men, on the other hand, superintend the girls' sewing classes. Again, women might not be able to put boys through their drill, but they can exercise a very good homely influence over children which many men cannot do. I have noticed that boys do not aspire usually to become pupil-teachers, and I can well understand that. My experience is that many colonial boys do not care for constant study. That is particularly the case in the country schools. I asked one boy the reason of this (he had been in a printing-office, and from that went in as a pupil-teacher), and he said, "I begin work preparing lessons at 7 a.m.; then I go into the school from 9 to 3; have probably an hour or two hours for recreation, and study again. It is study and work, study and work, all the time. "Why," said he, "after all, what standards do I take? I simply have up to Standard II. teaching simple addition, multiplication, and subtraction over and over again until I am tired of it." I think that is typical of the general rule. I find, too, that our boys are very independent as compared with English boys, and they are, as a rule, very precocious. The New Zealand boy is a thorough boy at heart, and a good boy at that. I find that there are many occupations or trades

which our boys prefer to the constant study that teaching demands. Boys prefer to go into an office for 10s. or 12s. a week, or to clean windows, than to teach at £20 a year, with no great prospect of advancement. It takes a boy many years to make a competency in the teaching profession. I was looking through our list of pupil-teachers the other day, and I found that out of seventy ex-pupil-teachers there were only eight males and no less than sixty-two females. Of fifth year pupil-teachers there were twenty-nine, three males and twenty-six females, the salary being £50 for males and £42 for females; of fourth year pupil-teachers there were twenty, one male and nineteen females, salary £45 for males and £36 for females. Other years showed: third, sixteen pupil-teachers, two males and fourteen females, salary £38 and £32 respectively; second year, thirteen pupil-teachers, one male and twelve females, salary £32 and £35; first year, one pupil-teacher, salary £25 (male) and £20 (female). Of probationers there are twenty, four males and sixteen females. This gives us 169 pupil-teachers, of which number only nineteen are males and no less than 150 females. I believe that in about twenty years we will have all female pupil-teachers, unless something is done to induce boys to enter the profession. I do not see why there should be any distinction between the salaries offered to the males and females. It is the levelling process in the matter of pay which is rousing opposition to the female teachers. It costs just as much for a woman to live and to complete her studies as for a man, and I fail to see why there should be any distinction made in the rate of pay. No such distinction is made in trades where equal work is done by the operatives, and why should it be done in the teaching profession? But let us look at another point. It would take a male five years probably before he got a school with, say, an average attendance of 25 or 26. It would take him another ten years before he got £150 a year, and by that time he would be about thirty years of age. One of the "plums" in the service is the headmastership of a town school, and the next best position, I think, is a first assistantship in a town.

The Chairman.] How often do those "plums" grow?

Mr. Joplin.] Well, a vacancy occurs when a headmaster dies. The hardest-worked teacher in the profession is the man with a school of from 70 to 75 children, and I will tell you why. He has a pupil-teacher under him who has the Second Standard. The master has Standard III. up to Standard VII., and he has to keep going all the subjects of these standards. He has to keep those subjects constantly in his mind, continuously running over the work, and spending half his time in a weak pupil-teachers' room to see that everything is going on all right. He has also the responsibility of meeting parents, the grievances of Committees and so on. How different the lot of the first assistant in the town school, receiving about £220 a year, with only one class to teach instead of four or five, as in a country school; besides which, he has opportunities of prosecuting his studies which the country master has not. In town the responsibility is taken off the shoulders of the assistant and put on the headmaster's. Another school, the master of which is underpaid, is the one with an average attendance of from 20 to 40. You do not get a pupil-teacher until you have an average of 41. The man with an average of 40 has to devote a great deal of his time to the work of the infant classes, and it is chiefly the infant classes which impede the work of the country master. As regards the cost of living, I find that to the suburban master rent is often a very heavy item where there is no teacher's residence. Take my own case. I was transferred from Mauriceville West to Wadestown. At Mauriceville, I received £205 a year, but on removing to Wadestown, I received £215 and £20 house allowance, making £235 in all, but £20 is not enough by any means. As a result, I stand to lose £44 a year. In the town schools they are allowed £50 a year house allowance. I recognise that one of the greatest difficulties that Boards have to contend with is to provide suitable residences for the teachers. Every teacher should be obliged to reside near his school. Another point is expense of removal. It cost me £10 to remove from Tenui to Mauriceville West, but I did not recover one penny of the expense from the Board. It cost me also £15 to remove from Mauriceville West to Wadestown, so I have £39 to make up with an increase of £10 a year. I would suggest that some provision be made for allowances to teachers when they are removing from one school to another. Referring again to the cost of living in the town and the country: I have a wife and family of six to maintain. Butter costs 1s. a lb. in Wellington, and 8d. in the country; flour costs 8s. 3d. per bag in town, and 9s. 3d. in the country; meat is about 5d. per lb. in the country, and about from 5d. to 8d. in the town. Clothing is a little cheaper in town, but as against that there is more wear and tear in town, and generally people dress better than in the country. In regard to the experiences of country teachers, I once saw an entry in a log-book by a struggling master. "What with the Government, Education Boards, Inspectors, parents, and children, I am betwixt the devil and the deep sea." My own experience of an Education Board is that, as employers, teachers could not have more considerate masters than the Wellington Board. If the Board has funds, and a teacher applies through his Committee for anything reasonable, he gets fair play. That has been my experience, and the same may be said of the Inspectors. One of the greatest demands upon the funds of Education Boards arises from the repairing of old school-buildings, and this will continue until the buildings are erected more substantially.

Mr. Luke: I thought the pay of pupil-teachers was fixed by Government regulations. I remember a case in Auckland where equal pay for the male and female pupil-teacher was insisted on. They would not approve of our regulations until we agreed to that.

Mr. Hogben: Since 1895 a policy has been adopted by which, in all cases of revision of the regulations, the pay for female pupil-teachers has been made equal to the pay for males. But this has not been allowed to interfere with regulations that have not been brought under revision.

1860. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you considered the suggested scale of staffs and salaries?—Yes, I have somewhat.

1861. Do you consider it an improvement on the present system?—I cannot say I think it is altogether an improvement.

1862. How many children could you teach in a country school?—I have taught 56.
1863. Efficiently?—Yes.
1864. Was the Inspector's report favourable?—Yes.
1865. How long ago was that?—About 1893 or 1894.
1866. With the system of classification in vogue, do you think you could teach that number?—Well, yes; but I do not propose doing to. Why should I when the Board allows a pupil-teacher?
1867. *The Chairman.*] If you got more pay you would consent to teach more scholars in proportion?—Yes.
1868. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Then, it is the pay which is not as good as you think it ought to be?—Yes, I think better salaries ought to be paid, though I would not say that better teachers would be secured. I know of two female teachers now willing to come into the city from the country schools for lower salaries than they are at present getting.
1869. Do you notice that there is a marked improvement for country salaries in the proposed colonial scale?—Not if the teacher is married and has a family, with insufficient house allowance. It is not an improvement in that case.
1870. Do you mean to say that the salary should depend on whether the teacher is married or not?—I do not want to discuss that. It is too wide a question.
1871. Do you consider it necessary to bring in the infant mistress at 41 instead of a pupil-teacher?—Yes, an assistant who has had experience is required in a school like that.
1872. Supposing it meant a decrease in your salary?—Ah, that is a different thing. When it touches the pocket I am just like others.
1873. You think that the work of country teachers is a good deal more arduous than that of town teachers?—Yes.
1874. Is that the reason you consider there is a reason to gravitate toward the town?—That is one reason, but the teacher also considers his family.
1875. Do you advocate substantial increases of salaries for teachers in country schools so as to induce the best class to go into the profession?—Yes.
1876. Which do you prefer—payment by grades or by units?—In a growing school I prefer units.
1877. With regard to expenses for removal: is it not a fact that you applied for a removal yourself?—Yes.
1878. You took into consideration that you would have to pay the cost of removing?—I thought some allowance would be made, as is done in Australia.
1879. You advocate equal pay for equal work?—Yes.
1880. Do females do the same work as male teachers?—Yes. As far as I know, lady teachers who are in charge of country schools do the same amount of work, except that they cannot superintend the boys' games.
1881. But do the male teachers in the country schools do that?—Well, I always do, and I know other teachers who do the same.
1882. Do you consider the present working average too low?—It does not affect me to any appreciable extent.
1883. *Mr. Hill.*] Did I understand you to say that teachers in the Old Country were not so well paid as those in New Zealand?—Yes; but I speak of fourteen years ago.
1884. Do you know what salaries the teachers in London are getting now?—No.
1885. Do you know what they are getting in Birmingham?—No.
1886. In Nottingham or Manchester?—No.
1887. I understood you to say that the standard of education in England is lower than in New Zealand?—Yes, that is relative to the Sixth Standard.
1888. Did you compare it with the average age?—No.
1889. You are not aware that the children in the Old Country pass their standards at a lower age?—No; but if they do it is because the work is easier.
1890. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you think that our pupil-teachers are receiving sufficient education?—Well, I cannot say, in a broad sense; but as I look at the work set for them by the Education Board I think they are receiving sufficient.
1891. Do you think that pupil-teachers should be working all day, the evening being employed in study?—No; I do not think any one is worth much after working all day.
1892. Do you think the sexes ought to be worked together in schools, or separately?—I do not think there is any advantage to be gained by working them separately.
1893. You would advocate the teaching of the sexes together?—Yes.
1894. What is, in your opinion, a living-wage for male and female certificated teachers in country schools: I want to know what you think should be the minimum wage?—For a young man, £100.
1895. And for a lady teacher?—The same; I believe in equal payment.
1896. Do you think lady teachers are qualified to take a school of, say, 40 children and teach all the standards?—Yes.
1897. What is your opinion in regard to sick-pay allowance?—If a man is married and has a family his household expenses go on just the same, and he should be paid accordingly.
1898. To what extent?—Full payment for a month; then, if not recovered, say, three-fourths the next month, and, say, one-half the third month. I do not see why a sick teacher should be turned adrift.
1899. What should be a compassionate allowance to the widow of a deceased teacher?—That, I think, should be allocated on the number of children she has, their age, and their earning ability.
1900. Each case should be controlled by circumstances?—Exactly.

1901. Have your schools in New Zealand been sufficiently equipped, kept clean, and in every sense provided for?—My experience is that the capitation is not sufficient; and as a result we have to get up concerts, &c., to supplement our funds.

1902. You think the incidental allowances insufficient?—Exactly.

1903. Are a sufficient number of scholarships granted by your Board?—In a growing district such as Wellington I think there ought to be two or three more scholarships. The number is not sufficient at present.

1904. Should country children have an advantage of, say, a year in age when competing against children of town schools?—Yes, I think it would be advisable; but it must not be forgotten that such a school as Masterton ranks the same as a town school.

1905. But I refer to small schools.—I do not know why the difference should be a year. If the teachers are working properly, and complying with the syllabus, I do not see why it should be necessary to give such an advantage. At Mauriceville I had three or four children whom I considered quite strong enough for scholarships, but their parents said they preferred to find work for the children at home.

1906. But do you think that, considering the circumstances of some of the small country schools, an allowance of one year should be made?—Taking everything into consideration I must say yes.

1907. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that pupils in the country schools are receiving fair treatment? Is the work of probationers such as they can easily overtake, or is it excessive?—I think that where they are teaching and studying at the same time too much is demanded of them.

1908. Have you ever known cases of young and promising pupil-teachers breaking down under the strain of brain-work?—I cannot say that I remember any such case.

1909. Have you heard complaints of the strain of work?—When first-year pupil-teachers were appointed to my school they complained about being expected to study and teach at the same time. It would be better if pupil-teachers before entering the service were required to pass some standard examination for entrance. No girl should be allowed to teach under the age of seventeen years.

1910. You think they are sent to work when too young?—Yes.

1911. Are pupil-teachers sufficiently paid in this district?—No; I do not think they are. I have three boys of my own and some girls, and none of them would enter the teaching profession as it is now.

1912. What do you think would be a fair and reasonable remuneration for pupil-teachers?—If residing at home, they ought to get £30 a year to begin with.

1913. What increase each year would you give him: would you give him a £20 increase?—No. I would pay, say, £30, £35, £42, and then £52, because by that time the teacher would be about twenty or twenty-one years of age, and would have received experience and education equivalent to an apprenticeship in a trade.

1914. Having passed their apprenticeship as pupil-teachers, do you think a preparatory course of training necessary before granting a certificate?—Yes; because while they are merely pupil-teachers, in such schools as I have had charge of, we have not had the time to give them a practical insight into the real work of teaching. With the master in one room and the pupil-teacher in another, as is now often the case, there must be a sacrifice somewhere.

1915. Now, from your long and varied experience can you say whether there is one class of teacher which you think worse paid than any others. Take, for instance, this district, town and country combined: what class of teacher ought to have a considerable advance in salary?—Well, teachers in the country with schools of an average under 100—say, from 65 to 100—ought to get at the very least £225 a year. Then, in schools of from 50 to 65 the masters should get at least £205. As regards schools having an average of 41 to 50, I do not think that any teachers ought to get less than £175. For an average below that, even aided schools, I do not think any one should get under £100.

1916. You think £100 should be the minimum fee even in the case of aided schools?—Yes. A teacher must live; and consider, too, what he sacrifices by going back far into the country, into isolated parts.

JAMES ROBERTSON, Member of the Wellington Education Board, examined.

Mr. Robertson: I have not gathered from the reports which have appeared in the newspapers whether you seek to get from witnesses what they consider to be an ideal scale of salaries for teachers, or whether you are trying to make a just proportion on a £4 basis. I thought that your duties in Wellington would have been easier, because some time ago the Teachers' Institute, when discussing the question of salaries, pointed out what they considered to be some of the injustices, and the chairman stated that the injustices were so great that those teachers in receipt of the higher salaries would be prepared to make a sacrifice in order to adjust the differences. However, I have not seen anything of such a sacrifice so far. On the contrary, every one seems to be fighting for his own end. I believe in a colonial scale of salaries if it will make the teachers more content with their lot, and I do not think that the difference of living throughout the colony is so very great but that a uniform scale could be drawn up. There would naturally be some items of expenditure greater in some respects. I read lately that a third assistant master in Wellington said it cost him £150 for house-rent. If that is true, then, to my mind, we have in the service of our Board a young man who is living beyond his means, as houses can be got for half that money. I recognise that there are certain disadvantages in connection with a colonial scale. It may be that the majority of teachers will be protected from the necessities of Boards; yet, on other hand, if a colonial scale is adopted, Boards will not be able to deal with

special cases of hardship as they have done in the past. In the Wellington Education Board we very frequently break our own regulations in order that teachers in out-districts should get better pay. Under a fixed colonial scale that would be impossible, and to that extent teachers would suffer. Another point in connection with a colonial scale is that if teachers are assured of their salaries free from any chance of reduction they cannot expect to get the same remuneration as is given to other members of the community whose incomes are fluctuating. If teachers get a colonial scale of pay, even on the present basis, they would be in a better position than they are at present. If it will tend to make teachers better, then let them have it, providing, however, that the Education Boards retain the power of making appointments. I see no objection to a colonial scale so long as the Board has the power of making appointments. I should like to throw in my lot with those country teachers who say that schools with an average attendance of 75 ought to be paid as much as the first assistant in a city school. I have always thought that the first assistant in a city school holds one of the best positions in the service. I heard a first assistant say in evidence that he had to organize in his school. Well, that seemed to me to be a reflection on his chief, the headmaster. I cannot understand why an assistant should have so much organizing. He cannot have as much as the country master with an average attendance of 75. Furthermore, the headmaster has the responsibility of classification. Perhaps the Inspector expects a higher standard of work from the first assistant of the city school than he does from the master of the country school. In the city schools, too, Committees attach a great deal of importance to the average of scholarships gained; but I might say here that the average of scholarship awards in the city schools is pretty regular. No particular school seems to preponderate in this direction. We seem to expect a first assistant to be something of a specialist in preparing candidates for these scholarships, and probably that service ought to be paid for. It is worthy of consideration, too, that the country master must be the social equal of professional men—the doctor, the clergyman, and the lawyer—and to that extent he is put to an expenditure which the assistant in the city school need not incur unless he chooses. As to the rates of pay for male and female teachers, I may say that I do not think women are equal to men as teachers. I know that equal pay is unanswerable as a proposition, but when it is applied to the teaching profession it is simply begging the question. I think the female teacher makes her boys effeminate; they get into namby-pamby kind of ways that have to be knocked out of them in the playground. Women have far more violent likes and dislikes than men, and quite 90 per cent. of the complaints as between parents and children arise from actions of female teachers. I do not think they are so capable physically either, though the Boards may be to blame for that: we, perhaps, overwork them. Then, again, the Education Boards have to keep a far larger staff of female teachers on account of sickness than would be the case if males were employed exclusively. Marriage was another important factor affecting women teachers. Marriage binds a man more securely to the Board's service, but, in the case of female teachers, it means the loss of an apprentice that the Board has been at considerable expense to train. With reference to the payment of females, I would make an exception so far as the smaller schools are concerned — say, up to 40 — where the children have to travel long distances and remain in the custody of the teacher. I think the girl is the better guardian than the young man in these cases, and therefore such teachers ought to be paid at the same rate as a man. The great difference between the two sexes is that women did not seriously go into the profession as a life-long career. They rather make a convenience of it until something better turns up. I have read of a female teacher in our own service, a B.A., who said she was getting only £80 a year; but I have no hesitation in saying that if she had applied for a country school she would have had one. The whole trouble was, the girls will not go into the country if they can help it. In the event of applications being invited for a position in a town school, I could, before opening the envelope, mention the names of at least ten who would be applicants. The ten applications would be from girls in the country, but it would be the rarest thing possible to get the girl in town to apply for a country school, and, unfortunately, these girls are best fitted educationally for the service. They are the best equipped, but they will not go into the country. Humanely speaking, I do not blame them; but when you look at it from an economic and educational point of view, it proves that the females are not so valuable as men, who have less objection to going into the country. As a consequence of this, the country schools are not so well staffed as they otherwise might be. The country girl's social ideas are not so large as the city girl's. The country girls do not consider it *infra dig.* to go and live with settlers, because, as a rule, their own parents are settlers. I think Inspectors should be under the control of the department. As things are now, an Inspector does not make recommendations for changes and improvements in the style of teaching. He is frightened because he thinks the Board's funds, perhaps, will not permit the carrying-out of his recommendations, and this is particularly true with regard to making reports as to the condition of school-buildings. I say the Inspector is hampered in making his report if he knows that the Board has not the funds to give effect to his recommendations. I think that Inspectors should be removable from one place to another periodically, and I say this because I have a feeling that the quality of education throughout the colony differs very much. The variation is not indicated by the number of passes that are obtained, the percentage being fairly equal. But it seems to me that every Inspector must set up a certain ideal in his mind, and a man of a higher mental calibre will set up a higher ideal. Therefore I believe that by making Inspectors removable a better average of education will be obtained throughout the colony. Further, I think the Inspector-General should be an officer who examines schools himself. He should visit all the districts to see for himself what the general average is. If there was such an official, his annual report would be a much more valuable document than it is now. Under the present system you have in the Inspector-General's report only a review of the state of education as it appears to the local Inspectors. There is no grouping of the whole of the education of the

colony. Ever since our education system started I can remember only two really comprehensive reports upon it: one presented by Sir Robert Stout when Minister for Education, and a report prepared by Dr. Laishley for the Atkinson Government. Some of the witnesses have spoken as to the amount of capitation granted to School Committees. I, myself, think that at the present time the capitation allowance is too small, and it is becoming of even less value. With the progress of the colony—due largely to the dairy industry—settlers are becoming more independent, and many wives of settlers no longer care to undertake the duties of charwoman at the schools, and, to meet the difficulty, girls have sometimes formed working-bees after school-hours to clean and tidy-up the school. I believe that the capitation allowance for Committees would be better spent nowadays if the Board undertook the maintenance and cleaning of the schools. I am quite aware of the cost of sending men into the country for this purpose, but still I think it would be better to keep a few plumbers and carpenters here and there. I believe the Committees would readily sacrifice a certain portion of their capitation if the Boards would undertake to keep the schools in good order and repair in this way. In connection with the Inspectors, possibly one objection to their removal as I have suggested is that they would not be so well able to arrange the classification. I can quite understand that Inspectors must be familiar with a teacher's work, but I think there could very well be a reform in the present method of classification. There are certain differences that might be abolished. I have not met a man yet who could tell the value of a certificate from the numerals as used in the present form. I think such minute divisions are a mere affectation at being exact. Take the division of E5. I understand that numbers are given by the Inspectors to denote certain qualities from "excellent" to "tolerable," and so on. Now, it seems to me to be a farce to attempt to express human qualities in numbers. I do not believe in these minute divisions which, under the present method, the Inspector makes, and I think much depends upon the mood which the Inspector happens to be in at the time. With reference to certificates, I do not attach much importance to a degree, unless it has been obtained by passing through a secondary school and by keeping terms at a university. I find that degrees obtained through private or solitary study do not, as a rule, give culture. Unless such studies make a man at least a gentleman, the degree obtained has not a high value. I find that teachers are not so badly equipped in literature, but they are terribly deficient in the knowledge of men and things. If plenty of money was available it would be a splendid thing to send our teachers away on a tour as part of their training, as was at one time the custom, I believe, in Germany, where it was considered that no young man's apprenticeship was complete until he had travelled. It is not surprising if teachers who are talking to children all day long, day after day, come to regard the whole world as a lot of children.

1917. *Mr. Davidson.*] You believe in the principle of a colonial scale of salary?—Yes.

1918. I understand you to say that this Commission need not take into consideration the difference in the cost of living in drawing up a scale?—Yes, that is so.

1919. If this Commission could draw up a scale of staffing and salaries, and the Boards retained the power of transferring or dismissal, do you think that inequalities would be removed, and that the best interests of education would be served?—Yes.

1920. You think the headmaster of a school of an average of 75 should be paid as much as the first assistant in a city or suburban school?—Yes.

1921. Have you seen the alternative scale?—No.

1922. Well, the alternative scale seems to fit in with what you suggest; it is pretty nearly on the same lines?—Yes; but what I feared was that the country teachers' salaries were going to be brought down.

1923. Are you aware that, of 147 schools in the Wellington District, seventy-seven are in the grade under 35 of average attendance?—Yes.

1924. The same would apply generally throughout the colony?—Probably.

1925. It is that class of schools which should be carefully provided for?—I think the schools which require nursing are the schools with an average of from 15 to 40 or 45.

1926. In the grade of 25 to 30 the salary paid by the Wellington Board is £100, but in the suggested scale it would be raised to £130 and £140. There is, again, an improvement for the schools of from 30 to 40 averages?—Yes, I believe in those increases. The proper thing would be to treat the whole district as one large school, saving out of the large schools to support the smaller.

1927. You did not think it was the duty of the first assistant to organize?—I say it is the duty of the headmaster.

1928. Then, if the statement made is true the assistant is doing the work of the headmaster?—I say it is a reflection on his chief.

1929. Have you any idea how many female teachers the Wellington Board employs?—I say we have to employ 10 per cent. more females than if our schools were staffed by males.

1930. Of the number of females who are trained, how many leave the service?—Well, not many, because there is not a great leakage from marriage.

1931. It has been stated that, of those trained for the service, four females to every one male leave the service?—I do not know that. I repeat, however, that female teachers are not so valuable, because they do leave the service earlier than men.

1932. I understood you to say that women require sick-leave much more frequently than men, and for longer periods?—Yes; I say that women are not physically up to the work demanded of them. I think we break them down during the pupil-teachership period.

1933. Are women teachers in the Wellington District underpaid?—Yes; there is too great a discrepancy between their pay and that of the men. I think a differentiation of 10 per cent. would be sufficient.

1934. You would decrease the disparity?—Yes, exactly.

1935. Supposing Inspectors were placed under the charge of a central department, and regulations made whereby their advice on any educational question should be given to the Boards when necessary, do you think that would in any way weaken the power of the Board?—Perhaps not, so long as no other power was taken from the Board.

1936. I mean that the Board should still have the power to appoint, transfer, or remove teachers. The advice of Inspectors would be available to the Boards: would the Boards be weakened by such an arrangement?—I do not think so. It would improve the position. I think it would be better if the Inspectors were free of the Board, so as to remove the tendency which at present exists to give way to the Board. I think an Inspector would be a freer agent under the control of a department, provided the department would use judgment in making a selection.

1937. Would you make it a condition that the department must remove Inspectors periodically?—Yes.

1938. Would you limit the time of an Inspector's stay in one place to, say, three or five years?—I would say five years.

1939. What sick-allowances are given in Wellington?—We give a month on full pay.

1940. It has been suggested that, pending the introduction of some scheme of retiring-allowances for teachers, it would be advisable to provide some allowance for over sixty years of age; a month's salary for each year of service: would that be a good thing?—Yes. A teacher in our service retired of his own will, and we gave him six months.

1941. You made a suggestion about repairs to school-buildings; have you heard that such a system has been in use in other districts for some years?—No.

1942. Well, such is the case, and it has given satisfaction. Now, regarding appointments to country schools, supposing a school with an average of about 50 was vacant, would that be open to female teachers?—Yes.

1943. Do you get a fair proportion of lady applicants in such cases?—Yes.

1944. What is the experience of the Board in the matter?—It is quite a common experience for the Board to receive from a Committee the request, "We want a male teacher." One reason given is that female teachers cannot control the boys so well. At any rate, she does it in a different way; she cajoles them, and, though she gets the same result, it is done in a way that is not so good or the boy ultimately.

1945. You complain that a great many lady teachers prefer to remain in the towns?—Yes.

1946. Can you tell me the largest school you have in charge of a lady teacher?—The Girls' School at Mount Cook, Wellington.

1947. I am referring to country schools?—The highest average is something under 150.

1948. Do you think a colonial scale would be an advantage if adopted, provided the Boards retained the control and appointing of teachers?—Yes.

1949. You said you thought Inspectors would feel it rather objectionable to recommend an expenditure when they knew the Board to be short of funds?—Yes.

1950. What do you mean to imply by that?—I think the Inspectors would feel it as a loss of status to report something which they had reason to believe the Board would not do.

1951. *Mr. Luke.*] You said the social standing of a teacher in the country was different to that of the teacher in town. I would like you to explain, as that is quite new to me?—I say that the teacher in the town does not occupy relatively the same social position as the head-teacher in the country school. The latter is probably the best-educated man in the community or district. He is made a confidant, and his advice is often sought; for the uneducated man generally seeks the educated and consults him, so that in that way the country teacher holds a more important position. Like the clergyman, his conduct is under the scrutiny of the whole community, and this is but another reason why the profession is not so attractive to young men. On the other hand, the teacher in the city is to a large extent swallowed up among many.

1952. You said you did not consider the teaching given by women to be equal to that given by men: are you aware that Inspectors' reports and the testimony of parents go to show that the teaching by women in the colony is excellent—helps to mould the character and encourage chivalry and everything that is good in boys?—Yes; but I do not admit that the Inspector is the ultimate judge of education. The real result of education is found later in life.

1953. I cannot agree with you there. You said that a certain lady who told us she was receiving £80 a year might have had a country school if she had applied?—Yes; that lady is at a school at Roseneath, a suburb of Wellington. She is in one of the best schools in the district, and the Board would have been glad to have got the services of one of her type for a country school.

1954. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Does the Wellington Board recognise that too many country schools are established?—Yes.

1955. Would you favour an Inspector having power to refuse a teacher's certificate or to reduce it?—Yes.

1956. According to the Inspector's report to the Wellington Board, Inspectors are consulted in the selection of pupil-teachers: is that so?—Yes; but the power to appoint rests with the Board.

1957. Does that system work satisfactorily?—Well, it has only been in vogue about twelve months.

1958. Does the Board consult the Inspectors in regard to claims for the establishment of new school districts for outlying schools?—Yes, invariably. It is, I might say, the fault of our method that the only report the Board sees from its Inspectors is their annual report. Other periodical reports are laid on the table; but with the limited time we have we do not see them, and we do not know that we have been ignoring Inspectors' recommendations until we see the annual report.

1959. With regard to the proposed capitation, you know that we are restricted to £4 a head, and under the scale drawn up that capitation will entirely disappear?—Yes; I imagine that under a colonial scale the annual appropriation will vary. You cannot confine yourself within certain limits, and that was our trouble when the department gave us so-much, so we created anomalies in order to use up the money.

1960. With reference to the establishment of small schools, do you think the Legislature should lay down a minimum, below which schools ought not to be established? Suppose we lay down as a rule that unless the average is, say, 20, 15, or 10 a school shall not be established in which the teacher is to be paid acccording to this scale?—Yes; that is the present system. Where the average is less than 15 we give them all the capitation, and help them in other ways. We send them money for a room.

1961. Do you advocate that teachers should be appointed solely by the Board?—Yes, after consultation with the Committees. I think the ultimate power of appointment should rest with the Board.

1962. Is it not a fact that teachers who are known to members of School Committees are likely to be selected, irrespective of their merits?—They are frequently recommended.

1963. Is it not the case sometimes that after teachers have been recommended by the Board for appointment Committees still oppose the appointment?—Yes; but I do not find that the opposition lasts any length of time. Committeemen, as a rule, are fair-minded, and a teacher, who is worth his salt, generally lives down the opposition.

1964. What about transfers?—I do not think we transfer teachers without consultation.

1965. Do you consider a transfer is tantamount to a new appointment?—Yes.

1966. Do Boards give preference to female teachers for economic reasons?—Yes.

1967. If female teachers' salaries were raised, would preference then be given to men?—Yes, I think that would be the case ultimately.

1968. Do you consider that there should be a percentage arranged on a sliding-scale, increasing in difference according to the amount of salary paid?—Yes, something of that sort might be arranged; but I would not say that under any circumstances I would make the difference as much as 25 per cent.

1969. Have you a staff of relieving-teachers?—There are two relieving-teachers.

1970. Are they getting a regular salary?—Yes.

1971. How does that system work?—It is imperative with us in order to keep the schools staffed and to fill vacancies.

1972. Have you any difficulty in enforcing the Truancy Act in this district?—Well, I think the establishment of a Truant Officer was a mistake. I believe that he does get a number of truants in; but, on the other hand, the effect is to educate parents to know what a "half-timer" is. The parents got to know the law and then continued to take advantage of it.

1973. With regard to the proposed allowance in the suggested scale of 11s. 3d., do you consider that sufficient?—I cannot estimate that.

1974. Committees complain now that the allowance is insufficient, and we have heard that they have to supplement their funds in various ways?—Yes, that is so.

1975. Would you favour the establishment of a training-school for teachers?—That is a matter I do not know a great deal about. I can only conceive a teacher being trained for his profession among the pupils. The real training must be gained in the public schools, although I recognise the disadvantage of taking a headmaster from his work for this purpose. I would put a training-teacher in public schools, whose duty it would be to instruct pupil-teachers there. I think you have a splendid training-school in Canterbury. We have nothing like it here. If Inspectors were shifted about, then we would know all about these points.

1976. With regard to centralisation of Inspectors, you are aware that the Inspectors themselves in conference passed a resolution in favour of centralisation?—No, I was not aware of that.

1977. With regard to applications from outside this district, does the Wellington Board endeavour to promote its own teachers, and so discourage applications from outside, or does the Board place all on the same footing?—We have so many teachers of about equal merit that, in order to avoid jealousy, we have frequently to go outside; but, as a rule, we prefer to promote our own teachers when we can. If there should be an outsider head and shoulders above the others in merit we would appoint him. North Canterbury alone is turning out enough teachers to staff the whole colony.

1978. That is so; but it is hardly fair to your own teachers, is it?—That is what I say myself.

1979. Well, supposing you had a training-school?—I am not saying anything against a training-college.

1980. How long have you been a member of the Education Board?—Six years.

1981. You are not acquainted with the earlier doings of the Board?—As a School Committeeman I knew something about the Boards.

1982. How long were you a School Committeeman?—About ten or twelve years.

1983. Then, you have seen great changes in educational matters in this district?—I have not seen any changes, except perhaps the tendency towards technical instruction. Education has been rather stagnant.

1984. You mean there has been very little progress?—Yes. I cannot point to anything new. Mr. Lee introduced the teaching of science experimentally. Except as to this, drawing, and the teaching of cookery, I cannot say I have seen any change during twenty years.

1985. Are you not aware that demands upon the Boards are more numerous now?—Yes, that is so.

1986. You know that capitation is less than it was?—It is less than it was many years ago.

1987. And yet demands have increased?—Yes.

1988. You think that a colonial scale of pay is desirable in the interests of the teacher?—Yes.

1989. Would it be better for the whole body of teachers?—Yes.

1990. It is proposed to pay capitation of £4?—Yes.

1991. And out of that it is proposed that 11s. 3d. shall be reserved for distribution by Boards?—Yes.

1992. You think the functions of Boards will be minimised by the adoption of a salary scale as proposed?—I think not.

1993. Supposing that School Committees were to demand that the distribution of this 11s. 3d. should be according to scale, or that the central department should prepare a scale so that the Boards should have nothing to do with it, would that make a difference to the Boards?—I would not be in favour of granting that. The Board is continuous, whereas Committees are broken every twelve months. I think a body that is not a corporate body should not have control of buildings, for instance.

1994. Do not a number complain of not getting an equal share of the capitation?—Yes.

1995. Would they complain even if you gave them more?—I do not think so. They complain that they have too little to do.

1996. You do not think that the drawing-up of a colonial scale will limit the functions of your Board?—No; I think we are assisting you to do it.

1997. Yet you think the functions of the Board would be limited if the 11s. 3d. were to be taken away?—I would not agree to that.

1998. Do you not think the Committees could set up a claim, and say they too must be considered?—No. I do not think they have such a strong position as the teachers.

1999. Are they not very much concerned as to the character of the teachers, or as to the quality of the teachers they get?—Yes.

2000. Would you take away from the Committee the right of control in their own districts?—No. On the contrary, I would, as I have said, rather give increased responsibilities to Committees. I think Boards might consult them more fully in regard to making appointments of teachers. I would recommend reversing the present method, and send the names of all applicants to the Committees to make a first selection, the Board to have the power of confirming such selection or not. I believe this would give more satisfaction.

2001. How do you reconcile that view with what you told Mr. Gilfedder—that Boards should have the right of moving teachers from one place to another?—I said it would be more convenient for the Boards to have such right. At the present time a transfer is really a new appointment, as was proven the other day in the Nelson case.

2002. You say that women do not like going into the country: is that so?—Yes.

2003. They prefer to remain in the town, even at a lower salary?—Yes.

2004. Is it the same in the case of female pupil-teachers trained in the country?—Oh, no. Really you might say there are two staffs in the service of the Board—a country staff and a town staff. There is not the same desire on the part of city girls to go into the country as for country girls to come into town.

2005. Is not that because of the educational advantages in the town?—Yes; and the social advantages.

2006. The social or the educational, which?—Well, say, both.

2007. Suppose that some provision should be made to supply the educational needs of the pupil-teachers in the country so as to adapt their training to the peculiar needs of the country, and also some plan so as to adapt the training of the town pupil to the needs of the town: do you think that such provision would be preferable to the present system?—No; I think that would be bad at the present time. We already differentiate in scholarship-work as between town and country, and that is a recognition which I think is most deplorable. I think such a method as you suggest would intensify the evil.

2008. Do you not think that there are subjects for country children which would be better omitted, but left in for the town children?—Well, some such provision as that is being made in the technical-education system. I do not think you will get specialisation out of teachers who are expected to teach standards.

2009. You approve of a differentiation in the pay of men and women?—Yes.

2010. You do not favour separate schools for the sexes?—No, I do not; I think the establishment of a girls' school is a mistake.

2011. You think mixed schools would be far better in the interests of education?—Yes; I think the association of the sexes would be a mutual gain.

2012. Do you recognise that women can teach the Sixth Standard?—Yes; there are girls doing that work.

2013. Ought they not to get the same salary as men?—I say they do the same amount of work, but I doubt if the quality is the same.

2014. You would recognise that an equality of work should have an equality of remuneration?—Yes.

2015. You express an opinion, in your able remarks, that the Inspector-General of Schools should be required to inspect schools; I would like a little further light upon that subject: what is your general opinion?—I think I said that any one desiring to understand the educational system goes to the E.–1 report, and all that is to be seen therein is the report of local Inspectors. The general intelligence of the children, their manners, and discipline varies throughout the colony. A great deal depends upon the individual who inspects them. His opinions are embodied in the one report presented by the Inspector-General; but, apart from that, there should be a man of a philo-

sophical type of mind making one review of the state of education throughout the colony. He should be in constant touch with the various parts.

2016. Have you read a report of the Royal Commission on education in Victoria? There is a recommendation in the report on the lines you suggest?—I have not heard of that recommendation in that report.

2017. With regard to the classification of teachers, you feel that the present system is cumbersome?—I feel that it is valueless.

2018. If a man obtains a diploma in any of the professions, what is it that makes his success in life—his diploma or his skill?—His skill.

2019. The diploma merely represents a certain amount of knowledge in a certain profession or calling?—Yes.

2020. And the teacher's certificate should do the same?—Yes.

2021. Is that what you mean?—Yes. I say there should be fewer certificates, but they should express more; as, for instance, D1 ought to imply that the teacher had been previously in charge of a school. There ought to be some certificate which would indicate that the holder had had charge of a school.

2022. Really, the certificates do not tell you that the holder is a trained teacher?—No, they do not.

2023. Do you think that self-reliance is a good quality, and that it should be fostered in the public schools?—Yes.

2024. You think it is a good quality, and that teachers should encourage self-reliance as much as possible?—Yes.

2025. You are aware that many teachers in the country are very much isolated: they are unable to obtain those educational advantages which men and women in the town have?—Yes.

2026. Supposing you find a man or woman situated in this condition, and that man or woman by utilising his or her time succeeded in passing, say, the C examination, would you give credit to that teacher? Remember, the study has all been done by himself or herself: would you give him credit for trying to raise himself?—Most certainly.

2027. Now, then, is there any difference between that credit and the credit due to a graduate who at very heavy cost of his own labour and effort obtains his diploma in the university: do you not think that self-reliance is shown here?—Yes, certainly.

2028. Why do you disparage the obtaining of a diploma by solitary study?—I expressed my regret that the result of solitary study was not the same as when the student had kept terms at the university. I contend that the man that has been trained at Oxford or Cambridge has, as a rule, far more culture than the student who studies alone. As to the success of solitary study, all the more credit to those teachers who show their perseverance; but I repeat that the result is not the same. I most certainly do not disparage any such study, rather the reverse.

2029. Which do you think is the better quality—self-reliance or culture?—Self-reliance is better for the individual, perhaps, but it does not follow that he imparts that same quality to others.

2030. *Mr. Weston.*] You advocate the centralisation of Inspectors: do you not think that, while that may be excellent in theory, it would be a little difficult in practice?—It might be.

2031. In the event of the advice of an Inspector being required as to the removal or otherwise of a teacher, or as to the condition of a school, would it not take more time, and occasion more difficulty, in applying for that information if the Inspectors were located at Wellington?—But I understand there would be no difference in the location of the Inspectors, or as regards their duties.

2032. Where, in practice, would be the difference, then, compared with their present position?—Well, for one thing, I do not think they would be so dependent on the will of the wishes of the Boards. At the present time they are amenable to the Boards. I think they ought to make their recommendations irrespective of whether they were likely to be given effect to or not. It seems to me that the Government Inspector would be more independent in that respect.

2033. Do you mean to convey the impression that Inspectors are so degraded as to pander to the wishes of the Board?—Oh, no; I never knew an Inspector to pander yet; but I believe, all the same, that an Inspector likes to keep good friends with the Board.

2034. Would he not be liable, through political influence, to be worked upon?—He might pander to the particular Government in power, and that is, I think, the strongest objection that can be urged against an appointment made by the department. It would be very unfortunate if a political man, or a strong sectarian, were appointed.

2035. In order that we may thoroughly understand each other, is it your opinion that an Inspector should be located for a certain number of years in a particular district, although he might be an officer of the General Government?—Yes, that was what I suggested.

2036. If the Inspectors are to be made General Government officers, would it not be better for those gentlemen to vary their circuits, so that different districts might have the advantage of different inspections from year to year?—That is what I advocate.

2037. I understood you to say that as Inspectors grow old so they would become weak and apt to overlook faults in the teachers and in the schools: would not that apply also to Inspectors even though they were Government officers?—No; in the one case the man grows grey amongst the colleagues of his youth, in the other case he would have to distribute them all over the colony instead of in his own district.

2038. With regard to capitation, do you advocate the payment of a fair and reasonable salary to teachers of all grades and classes?—Yes.

2039. Then, I presume you regard a particular capitation grant as being quite outside the calculation of this Commission or the Government?—I would consider the money spent on this

Commission wasted if the Commission did not make a recommendation apart from considerations of what it might cost.

2040. In the past have your Board's incidental allowances to Committees been sufficient for their requirements?—No.

2041. Were they materially insufficient?—No, I would not go to that extent.

2042. Do you consider that in the past the building grant to your Board has been enough?—No, it has not; and as one result we have had to keep salaries down in order to maintain buildings.

2043. You have diverted part of you maintenance funds for building purposes?—Yes.

2044. Are your buildings now occasioning considerable outlay for actual repairs?—Yes.

2045. Are those repairs likely to increase from wear-and-tear in the immediate future?—Certainly, as the buildings grow older.

2046. What do you consider should be the minimum salary for male and female certificated teachers in your district?—I think teachers ought to be in something the same position as the tradesmen—that is to say, when a young man is out of his apprenticeship he should get 10s. a day.

2047. What, in your opinion, should be the minimum?—I would not offer a man less than £150 a year.

2048. And the same for young ladies?—No; I would give them less.

2049. What should be the difference between the two?—I think, about 10 per cent.

2050. Have you considered a very important matter in connection with our business, at any rate—namely, the possibility of the present system of education breaking down from its great cost?—No; I do not fear that for a single moment. I believe this is the one expenditure that the people think they are getting their value for.

2051. So that, whatever it costs to give teachers a fair and equitable salary, you think it should be done?—Yes.

2052. And you think Parliament will assist to that end?—This Parliament or the next will do so at the next election.

2053. With regard to certificates, if a teacher has a certificate showing that the foundation has been laid you think that would be enough to work upon?—Yes; I believe in lessening the number of certificates.

2054. If you left it in that way, then there would be no necessity for what you suggested—viz., a certificate to allege the fact that the teacher had had charge of a school?—I would lessen the number, but I would express more in the certificate.

2055. You know that a lawyer gets a certificate?—He gets an authority to practise.

2056. And with that foundation he goes his way rejoicing or not, as the case may be: should not that same principle be applied in the case of a teacher?—Yes.

2057. Then, what becomes of your suggestion that upon a certificate it should be stated whether a man had been in charge of a school: is that necessary?—Yes; I do not think you can treat the teacher exactly in the same way as the lawyer. I think there ought to be one or two classifications for teachers. A lawyer cannot be said to be in a service, and the public can go to him or not, just as they please but in the case of teachers they are limited; and have a certain work to perform. I think the teacher's capacity ought to be expressed in the form of classification.

2058. You said just now that you would like to see the Committees possess more power, and also that they should make the first selection from the applicants for appointment as teacher?—Yes.

2059. It has not occurred to you that the Boards, with the Inspectors behind them, and the reports in their possession, should be better able to lead rather than to follow the Committee?—I do not think you are discriminating between selection and appointment.

2060. With the knowledge that a Board necessarily possesses, and the records it has as to the ability of teachers; and with the Inspectors behind them, should they not be in a position to guide the Committee?—No; I think it would educate the Committees if you gave them the opportunity of making the first selection. I would try to improve their position by making their election good for, say, three years. Give them a longer experience.

2061. Do you not think local influences would be brought to bear?—Not more than at present.

2062. Supposing that the Board did not approve of the Committee's selection, there would naturally be very great trouble?—Well, there is the same conflict now.

2063. But would not the conflict be less if the Board, with all its knowledge, gave reasons for its selection?—Boards give no reasons.

2064. With regard to what you said just now about the male and female teachers, would you advocate, in the formation of a scale of staffing, that the Board should have a discretionary power to appoint either a male or a female teacher to any vacancy that might arise rather than that there should be a rigid scale requiring under certain circumstances a master and in other circumstances a mistress?—I think we have asked the cream of the country to prepare a colonial scale. Therefore you will have a fuller knowledge than Boards.

2065. I ask you whether, in your opinion, it would be better to manufacture a rigid scale providing that in certain circumstances a master or mistress should be appointed, or whether discretion should be left to a Board to appoint a master or a mistress according to the circumstances, as they think fit?—I think that would be giving Boards a greater responsibility. I do not want Boards to lose any of their responsibility. The rate of salary should be according to scale. I approve of appointments in that way.

2066. Supposing that the discretion existed, and that we might put either a male or a female into a particular school, and that we elected to appoint a female, would you give the female, in that event, the same amount of salary as would be given to a male?—No; I would not pay the position; I would pay the individual when it comes to a question of the sexes.

2067. Do you think there should be any difference in the teaching of pupil-teachers in town and those in the country?—No; I say that merely certificated teachers cannot be specialists. I would give all pupil-teachers a general training.

2068. Would it not operate in this way: that if you gave them special training in the country they might be unsuitable for positions in town schools?—That would be so.

2069. Would it be advisable to give special subjects to children who might for the moment only be living in country districts?—The whole theory of technical instruction is to train children in accordance with their surroundings.

2070. But technical instruction would come later?—I agree with you most thoroughly in that. I think it is most unfortunate that we are, as I consider, interfering with the general system of education, and altering our time-tables in favour of technical education, which cannot be properly taught in the primary schools. Such instruction as that should come afterwards—say, at continuation schools.

2071. You consider that the mind should be prepared, strengthened, tuned, and made fit to receive special knowledge?—Yes.

2072. If we are to have manual and technical instruction introduced into our schools, do you not think it would be essential to have special teachers for these special subjects, or to have our school-teachers specially instructed so as to enable them to give such teaching?—It is expecting too much of the certificated teachers to require them to do that. I am in favour of giving drawing instruction, and as much science as you can get into the child, but it must be a general training.

2073. You said just now that you could not get girls to go into the country to teach; and that, on the other hand, the country girls wish to come into the town?—Yes.

2074. Could not the evil be remedied by giving Boards the absolute power to deal with teachers, and place them where they think fit?—No; there might be another remedy.

2075. What remedy?—Well, the Boards, if firm enough, might say that refusal on the part of the teachers meant dismissal.

2076. Would it not be for the benefit of the country schools that our scale, if possible, should be so framed as to induce those teachers who have acquired useful knowledge in our town schools to migrate to the country?—Yes.

2077. Would that be beneficial to the country at large?—Yes.

2078. What is your opinion with regard to sick-pay for teachers?—The Wellington Board's arrangement is, I think, a fair thing; the Board gives a month's salary, and after that the teacher loses it, but their position is kept open for them.

2079. Suppose a teacher has been with you ten or fifteen years, and falls ill, say, for a few months, would it not be fair to give him more extended pay?—Yes, if you will recommend the House in your report to provide for that by a vote.

2080. But I want your opinion. What do you think, as between man and man, would be a fair thing in such case?—I think that some such provision should be made as prevails in the other departments of the Government service—one month in every twelve months. I think that would be a reasonable basis to go on.

2081. You would rather do that than leave the teacher to the consideration, just or unjust, of the Board?—Yes. I think the allowance ought to be fixed by regulation.

2082. In regard to compassionate allowance to widows of deceased teachers, what do you think would be fair and right?—I think a month's salary for every twelve months of service should be sufficient. It would improve the position of the teacher.

2083. Give me your honest opinion: is the existing system of working female pupil-teachers a success?—No. It takes too much out of the girls; but I expect this will always be a difficulty.

2084. Would you not advocate the appointing of adult teachers where pupil-teachers are now used if money permitted it?—I can only say that I think it would be better if all pupil-teachers started on a matriculation basis.

2085. *Mr. Hogben.*] I see by the scale paid by your Board that there is a school at Tenui at which the master gets £195 a year, and the average attendance is only 25?—That is an anomaly, in which our Board is breaking its regulations. The master ought to get £100 according to the present average, but as the attendance fell off through no fault of his own the Board did not work the sliding-scale. The same thing occurred in similar cases until the Board found that it was paying over £1,200 a year beyond the amount which the regulations provided.

2086. There is also a case at Dreyerton in which the master is getting £105, the average being 31 scholars?—Yes. I am prepared to hear of any number of such anomalies.

2087. Again, at Mauriceville and Paikakariki?—I believe those are cases in which the teachers' salary should have been advanced, but the Board could not afford to do it.

2088. Again, a teacher at Makomako is getting £135, the average being 38?—Yes.

2089. Taking all such anomalies and inequalities of pay in these schools, do you not think it would be fair to equalise the salaries?—I see no objection.

2090. That is, apart from the interests of the present occupants of the posts?—You must ignore interests such as that in preparing a permanent scale.

2091. You would not see any objection to an equalisation if for the next four years the present occupants should not be reduced, thus allowing an opportunity to transfer?—If you gave that time it would perhaps be satisfactory.

2092. Exactly the same occurs in regard to female teachers at corresponding schools. There are twenty-six of them. You think they ought to be equalised in the same way?—Yes.

2093. With regard to certificates, supposing the certificate were to be simplified to denote first or second class, would that meet your views?—Yes.

2094. Would you approve of an understanding amongst the Inspectors that the higher figure should be given to such teachers as had shown such ability as would lead Inspectors to conclude that they could take charge of a school?—No, I would not give the Inspectors that power.

2095. Who would attach the label, then?—I say, let the teacher go into the school first for experience.

2096. You would go simply on the teachers' proved performance?—Yes.

2097. And the Board should have the right to demand the certificate at any time?—Just so.

2098. You made some remarks regarding manual and technical instruction, and deprecated the giving of special technical instruction in primary schools?—Yes.

2099. But you do not extend those remarks to manual instruction in schools? — Yes, most emphatically I do. I think it is regrettable to try to give manual instruction in primary schools. To take tools into the schools is a perfect farce, and opposed to all our modern ideas. There is a lot of "buncombe" talked about hand-and-eye training.

2100. But in other countries its value is admitted. In Sweden it is recognised and made compulsory to give hand-and-eye training?—Yes; but the success (if you refer to the success of German trade) is not the result of education, but the effect of the way in which they subsidise their industries.

2101. I am speaking of the effect of mental training. Are you not aware that pupils who do handwork in schools are better than other students at their lessons? — Well, I believe that statistics prove it, but I have my doubts.

2102. It is not only statistics, but the best authorities on education in England testify to the value of manual instruction in schools. However, you have not seen this hand-and-eye training? —I have not seen a great deal of it.

2103. But you are in favour of kindergarten instruction and drawing?—Yes. I admit that drawing is splendid; but, as far as kindergarten work is concerned, it is merely to keep the children occupied—there is as much education in the making of mud-pies. I would not teach these subjects as is done now. I would give more theoretical instruction and physics. I understand you are proposing to introduce into the public schools something of what we are doing in the technical school now.

2104. That is not so?—You are going to give a boy a plane, and then show him how to make tables.

2105. No; we are going to give him certain exercises?—I say that a boy should go to school with a satchel full of books, and not a kit of tools. So long as manual instruction in the primary school does not imply the use of workshop tools in the school, then I have no quarrel with you; but directly saws and hammers are brought into school, I differ.

2106. If we can show that mental training is improved by the pupil using his hands as well as his brain, would you not approve of it?—We differ there; I do not think you can do it.

2107. You are in favour of teaching drawing in schools?—Yes.

2108. And of teaching physics and other branches of science in a practical way, each pupil making his own apparatus, and working with his own hands?—Yes.

2109. Well, that is manual instruction. Do you think that the cost of manual and technical instruction should be met out of the statutory £3 15s. capitation?—I do not think that Boards should take money which belongs to the children of a public school and spend it on persons having no connection whatever with the State education system. I am glad, too, that the Government last year gave the public auditors power to control corporate bodies in a certain manner, the result being that we found out how much we were spending on those people who had left school. We saw how much money had been diverted from the grant for primary schools to technical schools. As a matter of fact, the present Education Act is too flexible; it is simply what Boards choose to make it.

2110. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that the existing syllabus might be extended so as to provide for hand-and-eye training?—No. I think the mind should be trained in the primary school.

2111. Do you think that the education imparted to Standard VII. children ought to be extended if parents are willing and able to keep their children at school for a greater length of time?—In that case you might overlap the secondary schools.

2112. Is it not a fact that many children passing through the primary schools who would take advantage of the secondary schools are not able to reach the latter for various reasons?—I do not think there is any wide gap between the primary and secondary schools.

2113. Would you not be in favour of dovetailing the primary and secondary schools?—Oh, yes. It is a great advantage, even for the sake of a change, that the pupils should be able to go to a separate institution after the primary school.

2114. Would it not be an advantage for Boards to have control of secondary schools?—No; I think the control is better under separate bodies.

2115. But do you not see any advantage in making our secondary-educational system as much national as our primary education?—I cannot see why the high schools are not called State institutions now, seeing how heavily they are endowed by the State.

2116. They have power to charge fees?—Yes.

2117. That makes them exclusive to some extent?—Yes.

2118. Do you think that exclusiveness might be abolished if the high schools were brought under control of the Education Boards?—You can work them better by keeping them as they are now.

2119. The reason I put the question is this: You seem to have a notion that the money proposed to be devoted to manual and technical instruction is not likely to be productive of the very highest results: do you not think that if that money were applied to the teaching of book-keeping, chemistry, shorthand- and type-writing, science and electricity in our ordinary day-schools, a great advantage would result?—I am not sure that it would. I do not think the time-table would admit

of teaching book-keeping, for instance. I do not believe in giving instruction as applied to particular industries, or occupations, in the primary schools.

2120. But a knowledge of book-keeping is so valuable and useful to every one?—Well, I doubt if the school period is long enough to permit teaching shorthand and book-keeping. A greater amount of time ought to be given to ordinary writing. Too often Inspectors are mere collegians, who do not look at what is going on round about them. As one result of this we have a style of writing (upright) taught which generally ends in a back-hand style. I was on a Committee and we took one of these copy-books to two or three heads of departments in the Government Buildings, and they said, "We would not have such writing here," nor would merchants permit it in their ledgers. Yet that style is being taught because the Inspectors say it is in vogue somewhere. [*Mr. Hogben:* It is being used in the public service now.] With regard to the scholarship questions, I think that the Inspectors of one district ought to prepare the questions for some other district than his own. I have an uneasy feeling that those schools which are examined immediately before the scholarship examination come out best, because the clever coaches observe the drift of the Inspector's thoughts.

2121. Have you known instances of country-school children winning scholarships and yet their parents were not in a position to allow the winners to take advantage of their award?—Yes, because the parents were unable to afford the expense. The scholarship allowance of £35 is not sufficient for children living away from home. Even the amount (£10) given in the city is not enough. It merely covers fees, and, with necessary expenses of books, a poor man cannot afford to send his boy even to Wellington College.

2122. Reference has been made to the Wellington Education Board being unable to adhere to its regulations in connection with the payment of salaries?—Yes.

2123. As to the large salary paid to the teacher at Tenui (£195), do you know anything of the circumstances of that teacher?—Yes. It is rather a bad case. He has been a very long time in the service. There are certain peculiarities about the case which would make it a hardship to cut down the salary. This is one of those cases which, under a fixed scale, Boards will have no power to deal with in a special way, and the teacher must be the sufferer.

2124. Where salaries are lower than they should be in the cases already referred to, is it due to any fault of the teachers?—No.

2125. Has the decreased attendance arisen from any circumstances over which the teacher has control?—No; and no effort on his part would have made any appreciable difference in the attendance.

2126. Has the Board endeavoured from time to time to find positions for these teachers?—Yes.

2127. If the Board adhered strictly to its regulations, would not some teachers be placed in such a position that they would be unable to maintain themselves?—Yes, that is so.

2128. The fact is that in this district, at all events, the Board has been unable to find situations for its deserving and experienced teachers?—Yes; and through not having power to make transfers.

2129. Would a colonial scale as now proposed improve matters?—I do not think a colonial scale is going to give all that is expected of it, but if teachers like a trial it is all right.

2130. If a colonial scale is adopted, and the fluctuations which we have witnessed in the Wellington District should continue, and schools now in a prosperous condition become worse, what will be the condition of teachers presently?—They will become worse off. If a colonial scale had been in existence in the Wellington District during the last five years teachers would have beeen in a worse position than they are now. They would have suffered, for instance, by the drop in the birth-rate. A colonial scale will dry up all our sympathies as far as Boards are concerned.

2131. As to the assistants in the city schools, you say lady assistants are very reluctant to go into the country: what about male assistants?—They go more readily into the country.

2132. When vacancies for first assistants occur in the city schools, whence do you generally get the bulk of the applicants?—From the country.

2133. Do the applicants include headmasters in the country?—Yes. It is beginning to be thought that only headmasters of country schools need apply for first-assistantships.

2134. Has that a beneficial or prejudicial effect on the country schools?—It has the effect of taking the best men from the country into the city.

2135. What you mean is this: that the country is really becoming a training-ground for assistants for the city?—Yes.

2136. Is it not advisable that large schools should be the training-ground for the small schools in the country?—Yes.

2137. Would it not be an advantage to young teachers if they were to be placed in the town schools to obtain a training before being appointed to the country?—Yes.

2138. You think it would be advantageous if the salaries of headmasters and mistresses in the country schools were raised, and the larger salaries of the town assistants were correspondingly reduced?—Yes, on the £4 basis. I do not think the town assistant gets too much, except, perhaps, as compared with the amounts paid to the country masters.

2139. Then there would be more room for the female teachers?—Yes, if better inducement were offered for positions in the country they would go there.

2140. If the ladies were paid more adequately as mistresses in the country schools you would have more teachers offering for the country from the city?—Yes.

WEDNESDAY, 26TH JUNE, 1901.

J. J. PILKINGTON, Headmaster of the Porirua School, examined.

Mr. Pilkington: In the first place, I wish to state I object to the minute classification of the proposed colonial scale in regard to the payment of teachers' salaries. I quite recognise it is a necessity, so far as the staffing of schools is concerned, but I do not think it is necessary to follow that minute classification so far, at least, as the payment to head-teachers of schools is concerned. I think that the system of the old Board classification is much more dignified, where they proceeded by 25's or so up to schools of 200, then from 200 to 300, 300 to 500, and so on. It does not seem to me necessary to make twelve distinct classes for twenty-six schools. For schools of 510 up to 1,020 there are twelve distinct classes—that is, there are only twenty-six schools of this class, and it gives an average of one class to every two teachers. That seems to carry the science of classification too far; and, while I say that I recognise it is necessary to have some method of classifying schools, still this is too minute a classification. A man who is capable of taking charge of a school of 200 children presumably is capable of taking charge of 250 or 300; if he is capable of taking charge of 500, then, presumably, he is capable of taking charge of 550, or 600, or 700. I object to the principle of what I call the "floating capitation"—that is to say, payment *per capita:* for every child who goes into a school it means an increase in salary, and a corresponding decrease for every child leaving the school. Such a system as that does not place the teacher at all in a dignified position—his thoughts are constantly occupied as to whether he will gain or lose a few shillings in salary. Supposing a teacher takes an unusual interest in the attendance of a child—it is not so likely to occur in the towns, but it is likely to occur in the country—it would place it in the power of parents to say that he was trying to increase his average attendance in order to obtain a corresponding increase in salary. At present we in the country have a sort of borderland, from which it is quite as easy to attend one school as another. At the present time we let the scholars go to whatever school they choose, but the introduction of such a scheme as this will lead to ill-feeling between many teachers, for the reason that they will be led to "cater," perhaps unwittingly, perhaps unwillingly, for the attendance of children at their respective schools. This would reintroduce the vicious system of payment by results, only the evil would be intensified, for under the old system we had to teach the child something when he came to our school; under this system all that is required is his presence. In the towns I think the effect would be worse, for I believe there would spring up a science of attracting children from one school to another. I live in a district that is peculiarly liable to be affected in this way; I have a school on one side of me three miles away, and another on the other side of me about eight miles away, but between that school and my school there lies a village which has no school at all. I refer to the fishing-village of Paremata. There are a considerable number of children there, who can attend the Porirua School, to which they have easy access by train, or they can go to the other school at Pahautanui, which the Board helps them to reach by subsidised coach-service. We teachers in these schools have had no difference of feeling, we live in perfect harmony; but if my salary or the salaries of those other teachers were likely to be affected by the attendance of, say, fifteen children that good-feeling would no longer exist between us. Therefore I may say at once that I should very much prefer to live under the old government of the Boards. I do not believe that in any place in the world there is a more satisfied body of teachers than those living under the controlling authority of the Wellington Education Board. I am quite sure that a colonial scale of salaries would interfere with this kindly and patriarchal government. I cannot see how it is possible that the members of the Board can take that deep interest they have always taken if this most important business of arranging teachers' salaries, and paying them, transferring them, altering this, that, and the other, and looking after the teachers in all their little troubles, is taken away from them. Under a colonial scale it seems to me that the Board's interests will be very much diminished; they will not take the same interest in the teachers. I think under colonial administration it will throw them open—I do not say that they will fall into the temptation—to all sorts of influences; for instance, in the opening of neighbouring schools they may permit influences to be brought to bear upon them to open schools that should not be opened. Politicians and other people will button-hole this friend and that friend on the Board and say, "It will make no difference to you whether you open such and such a school or not; you will not have to pay the salary; it will do good to us, and will not hurt you, so let us have the school." Such pressure has been listened to before in a slight degree, and under more difficult circumstances; but under a colonial scale I think that the circumstances are made much more easy for them, and they will be more amenable to such pressure. Whatever derogates the responsibility of Boards must of necessity derogate the quality of its members, and men of the calibre and character we have at the present time on Boards will not continue to offer themselves for office if their powers and responsibilities are taken away from them. I should like to say something about how this scheme has been brought forward. If I am wrong I hope to be corrected. I, as a member of the New Zealand Educational Institute, have seen the beginnings of the scheme, the early workings of it, and the whole thing brought to its present state of advancement. The arguments that have always been used were these: "As a matter of fairness to your fellow-teachers who are more poorly paid, we call upon you to sacrifice a little from your salaries in order to help your poorer-paid *confrères*"; and I may say I have seen these arguments carried on at meetings of the Institute almost to the verge of tears. We knew that if a colonial scheme was carried we should suffer, but our consciences were soothed, and we were told that any reductions we suffered would go to help our comrades who were suffering. Now, I find that under the colonial scale I would lose £40 a year out of a not too large salary; but instead of its going to help my poorer-paid brethren in Taranaki or Westland it is going into the pockets of my richer brethren in the town—men who are

highly paid by our own Board and who have never asked for, nor looked for, any advance in salary. I did not expect the salaries of better-paid men to be advanced to my detriment, to see myself suffering a reduction of 20 per cent. while they get an increase of 20 per cent. I think they should lose a little with me, and that they might have contributed £40 in the same way as it is proposed I should; but instead of it going to the better-class salaries it should go to those who are more poorly paid. Instead of this they are tacking £40 on to the salaries of the better-paid teachers in the towns, men who are receiving the highest salaries at the present time, and who will further benefit to the extent I have mentioned under the proposed scale. I do not say that no advancement is made in the salaries of the poorer-paid teachers, for they will benefit somewhat. Recognising, or fearing possibly, that a scheme of some sort will be carried, I can only say to you that it will press upon us who are losing so much very heavily, and we in Wellington, holding a certain class of school, seem to be the hardest hit of any in the colony. I see no one who is losing very much; I see advances all along the line. We have based our expenditure for the future under the impression that the salaries we are at present receiving, or something very near them, will be secured to us, and if you take a fifth of it away from us it is impossible for us to meet our engagements. I heard yesterday—I had not heard before—that there is a disposition on the part of the framers of the scheme to hold out the hope that no salaries will be reduced for the present—that something like four years' grace and warning will be given; but what might happen during those four years? All sorts of things might happen: these schools the Education Board may be asked to build will be built, and our salaries knocked out of tune and time. What security have we that in four years' time we will be able to claim the same salary as now? We have no security at all. Still, I shall be pleased to get an assurance that these salaries will not be so reduced until the expiry of four years. It was said yesterday by a member of the Education Board that the appointment of teachers should rest more in the hands of Committees. I think that would be a disastrous step—I take exactly the opposite idea. He thought the initiative should spring from the Committee and the veto from the Board; but I think the initiative should spring from the Inspector, the confirmation from the Board, and the power of final acceptance from the Committee; that the Committee should not decline an appointee unless they are able to show that they have very good cause. That gentleman does not know country School Committees like I know them, or he would recognise that it is a very wrong power to propose to put into their hands. Taking the prospects of teachers in New Zealand and comparing those prospects with the prospects of teachers in other countries I find that 82 per cent. of the schools in this colony are schools under 80 in attendance, and that the head-teachers of these schools will be receiving under £200 a year, leaving 18 per cent. to earn £200 a year and over. Now, in England, 20 per cent. of the head-teachers, male and female, are earning £200 a year and over, and if you take the male teachers alone of England 30 per cent. of them are earning £200 a year and over. In addition to this—this is the most important and vital point: vital indeed to the poorly-paid schoolmaster—they have a pension fund behind them. They have not to look forward to the providing of a sufficiency for their old age as the teacher who has no such prospect has to do. Now, I hold that it would be much better, if we were younger men, for us to "pull up our stakes" here and go home to England. I think we would have a much better chance of being among the 30 per cent. there than among the 18 per cent. here. I may say I am referring to the alternative scale, and I speak more from a Wellington point of view. There is a question I have not seen touched upon yet: what will the large schools be still further getting under the new regulations, "The Manual and Technical Instruction Act, 1900," which has just been issued from the Education Department, and distributed to the schools within the last week.

Mr. Hogben: They were issued in January.

Mr. Pilkington: We did not receive them until last week. It seems to me under these regulations the large schools will still have a very big pull over the smaller ones. We cannot expect, with our very few children who have passed Standard V., to take more than a few shillings, or pounds at the most—a £5-note would probably cover a small school. They will be able to make very large calls under these regulations in the large schools. They allow, I believe, as much as 15s. per head to be demanded from the paying authority. Who will get the money? Whether it will be the local authority of the school, the Board, the headmaster, or the class-teachers, I do not know. I do not know who the receiving authority is. I understand from the Inspector-General it will not affect the salaries of teachers in the slightest degree. I am sorry to see that there is a disposition in the proposed scheme to accept Class D certificate as being quite sufficient for the position of a teacher; and I think that is a great mistake—stamping the D certificate as being the desirable standard of education for the schoolmasters of the colony. This seems to me a short-sighted and uneducational policy—I might almost say an illiterate policy. I should like to have seen under the scheme something like the present Education Boards have under their schemes, of giving some slight encouragement to teachers of all classes to pursue their studies and to endeavour to raise their literary status. The Class D certificate must be recognised as a very low one, and I think it would be certainly desirable to encourage teachers to take a higher certificate, and lead them on step by step until they attain the highest certificate that is possible. It is a very poor aim, I think, to say to the country that the schools shall be officered by Class D men. Of course, it is not the case in all schools that they would be governed by men holding Class D, but, as set forth in the scale, it is practically an incentive to teachers not to attempt to raise their certificates beyond Class D. I am quite aware that Class C1 is laid down as the necessary qualification for schools of 250 in attendance; of such schools there are less than ninety in the colony to be officered by men with the classification of C. I am taking the Class D certificate as sufficient for the teachers of over fifteen hundred schools, and Class C the classification for about eighty or ninety that remain. Going back again to the early beginnings of this scheme and how we teachers of Wellington were induced to support it, I would like to say that the scheme proposed never would have been what

it is had the Teachers' Institute of New Zealand been really representative of the teachers of New Zealand. The Teachers' Institute of New Zealand represents the big teachers of New Zealand and not the small ones in any way; I shall be challenged on this point I know. It will be told me, and the lists of the different members will be shown me, in order that I may see that a majority of country members are members of the Institute in different parts of the colony. I say that makes no difference; those who make our laws and control our policy are not the country teachers, who are never properly represented. I will take the Council of the Institute in 1898, and I find that out of thirty-two to represent New Zealand only three represented the smaller schools, and the smaller schools comprise 85½ per cent. of the schools of the colony.

2141. *Mr. Hill.*] What is the average attendance of the schools comprising 85½ per cent. of the total number?—85½ per cent. of the schools of the colony are schools of less than 100 children. I have not said that salaries are too large in New Zealand; I have only said that the big salaries should not have been increased as long as there were very much smaller salaries being reduced; and, to show you the tendency that exists in the Old Country to pay teachers liberally, I will quote the scale of the Glasgow School Board. The Glasgow School Board has in its employment seventy heads of schools; six receive £200 and under £250, fifteen receive £250 and under £300, fourteen receive £300 and under £350, six receive £350 and under £400, seventeen receive £400 and under £450, six receive £450 and under £500, while six receive £500. The total amount of the salaries is £24,563, or an average of £315 18s.

2142. *Mr. Davidson.*] Can you give us the highest and lowest average attendance of those schools?—No; they are presumably large schools.

Mr. Hogben: I might point out that the average attendance of these schools is, I think, about 615.

Mr. Pilkington: The question of irregularity of attendance has cropped up; that is a great source of loss, so far as the salaries of the teachers in New Zealand are concerned, and also to the income of Education Boards. In New Zealand we have given a premium to bad attendance by saying to parents, you can keep your child away for two days in each week. In Europe the attendance regulations are very strict, and the police have not only authority to go to a school and look at the books in order to take the names of the children who have been absent only two days in a month, but they have the power, if they meet an unhappy child in the street, and think that child should be at school, to take the child to the schoolmaster and enforce attendance. Most minute instructions in this respect are given to the police in Holland. The question of technical education is going to loom very large in the schools. I think before we launched on this policy, which I hold to be very largely a policy of imitation—and not very far-seeing imitation at that—of the conditions that exist in other countries—conditions that are very different from those surrounding ourselves—that a Commission should have been appointed to inquire how far desirable it is for a country like ours to imitate that policy. This country, which is exporting three-quarters of its food material, proposes to imitate the conditions existing in the country which is importing more than half of it; this seems to me to be utterly absurd. We are proposing to enter upon a scheme of technical instruction in our schools—I am speaking only of the primary schools of the colony; I do not say that technical schools should not be established in our towns for our own local requirements, but to think that a system of technical education is going to make a country like New Zealand grow into a big exporting country seems to me to be ridiculous. It is very silly for a country existing practically on its natural resources to imitate in our primary schools the system of education adopted in countries that live on their manufactures. The two fundamental essentials of a manufacturing country are iron and coal. Have we got either of them? I do not think we need bother about other countries beating us in the race of exports and manufactures. I think that question should be threshed out before endeavouring to force technical education in the primary schools of the colony. Scholarships are doing a good deal of harm in the country schools; we have only one or two children who are likely to compete for scholarships, and as long as the scholarship system exists parents are urging us, in a direct or indirect way, to let their children enter into competition. In order to do that you have to drag the whole upper part of the school at the heels of these two or three scholarship candidates, up to a standard for which the class as a whole is unfit. If the subjects for scholarship examinations were exactly the same as for the standards, there would not be any great amount of harm done, but such is not the case. There is no doubt in my own mind that this system of scholarship examination is doing a great deal of harm in both the town schools and the country schools. With your permission, sir, I should like to quote from a speech of Sir Henry Craik, in November, 1900. He says: "Above and beyond any system of codes and of organization there was an element of danger in a false public judgment of the work of the school. Payment by results might be a mistake; but was the department the only sinner in this respect? Was not public judgment apt to be unduly biassed by immediate tangible results, forgetful that the training of the school was a slow process, of which the results might not tell till after years? Did it not sometimes err in giving and withholding the payment of its approbation by immediate results? Had we not for the last fifty years in our schools, in our universities, in judging the opening careers of our young men, given too much weight to competition, to the often flimsy and unsubstantial verdict of competitive examination, to the pitting of school against school, and of boy against boy, by the results of competitive examinations? Was it not possible that another generation may say that this had gone too far—that it was beneath the dignity of a great school to chronicle successes, and that many a fine career had been nipped in the bud by the evanescent results of a prize competition. They could not end them, they could not abolish competition. They could not run counter to a prevailing instinct, but at least they might beware of exaggerating its weight. They might doubt whether the physical prowess of the whole community was best increased by an insane effort to beat the record rather than by quietly

and steadily developing all in some simple physical exercises that might make them enduring and patient of toil, healthy and active, rather than fit to vie with professional athletes. So also with mental gymnastics, might they not throw away an immense amount of sound and serviceable material fit to serve their country by labelling them at the outset of their career with a mark which might very inadequately represent the intrinsic value of the metal that is stamped? Might they not, above all, in their public schools steal them away from the service of those who needed them most, and mask as a preserver of those who required least from them? A great statesman had pointed out the danger of public effort being gradually diverted from those who needed it most to those who needed it least. Let them beware of this mistake, and, while they said nothing against a healthy and wholesome rivalry, either in the schoolroom or in the playground, let them beware least they earn ridicule and condemnation of posterity by testing all training by a Chinese elaboration of competition with its inevitably deadening results." Those words should be well considered, so far as the question of scholarships is concerned. I notice a circular was sent out by the department a short time ago, within the last two or three weeks, asking us to name those children in our schools who had passed Standard VI., and how many of them would have proceeded to higher education if such were made free to them. I replied in my own case that four or five in my school would have proceeded to higher education had they the means. I think that would be a better way of settling this difficulty; let them have a higher standard, but not a competitive one of child against child.

2143. *Mr. Davidson.*] Were you trained as a pupil-teacher?—No.

2144. What experience have you had as a teacher?—I started in England in the capacity of assistant master in a grammar school; I was probably about one year there. I came to New Zealand, and joined the Wellington Education Board in January, 1875, first of all being assistant master in the Thorndon School. Afterwards I proceeded to a country school, with an average attendance of about 50; from there I went to a growing town school, with an average attendance of from 300 to 400.

2145. As headmaster?—Yes; from there again I went to a small country school, averaging 30 pupils; to another averaging 40 pupils; and, lastly, to my present position in the Porirua School, with an average of from 50 to 60.

2146. What is your certificate?—C1.

2147. What is your present average attendance?—For the last quarter, 59.

2148. In your evidence-in-chief I understood you to say that you objected to the minute classification of schools: will you explain, I do not quite understand you?—I thought that a scheme of classifying schools, like the Wellington Education Board does, would be a more dignified classification than a system which gives twelve classifications for twenty-six schools—better for the purposes of payment, that is.

2149. As a matter of fact, have you noticed that the classification of schools under the first suggested scale gives only three classes?—As far as certificates required for the various classes.

2150. You object to the payment of teachers by units instead of by grades?—Yes, I object to the payment by units; I do not see the necessity for all these classifications.

2151. You prefer that teachers should remain under the authority of Education Boards rather than be placed under the authority of a central department: do you think that by having one scale of staff for the colony, and also one scale of salaries, instead of thirteen as at the present time, it will take away from the Education Boards their authority over teachers?—Yes, that is my opinion.

2152. How do the Boards of the colony now pay their teachers; from whom do they get the money?—Presumably from the Government

2153. Would it not be sent direct from the department, and paid out by the Boards under any colonial scale?—It would be paid according to a scheme which a Board may devise, and which a Board would have the privilege of altering from time to time as it thought fit.

2154. Do you think there should be thirteen different scales of staffs and salaries: do you think it is in the interests of the teachers?—Yes; that the teachers should have a patriarchal body looking after their interests and in close touch with them.

2155. What has caused the dissatisfaction: is it not the grave inequalities which exist among teachers doing the same work and possessed of the same qualifications?—Yes, presumably.

2156. Would it not be in the interests of education that this dissatisfaction should, as far as possible, be removed?—Yes, but it is a question of how to remove it.

2157. If the anomalies and inequalities that are causing dissatisfaction were removed, do you not think it would be a good thing?—Yes, to those who are suffering from the anomalies and inequalities I dare say it would be a good thing.

2158. Do you think that under a national system of education men and women holding equal qualifications and performing equal duties should be paid the same salaries?—I know it is a question of abstract justice that they should be, but I am not aware of any country where they are paid the same.

2159. Not where teachers holding the same qualifications and doing the same work are paid under a colonial scale?—Possibly, in the Australian Colonies, they may be.

2160. In Queensland, New South Wales, South Australia, Canada, and France, is it not the case?—I should say it was most unlikely in Canada.

2161. I am not referring to the schools; teachers are paid under a uniform scale in the countries I have mentioned, are they not?—Yes, I presume so.

2162. If a satisfactory scale could be drawn up, do I understand you approve of the principle, and that you disapprove of the suggested scales?—No, that is not so; I hold that teachers would be much better looked after, and that you have a less, if I may use the expression, cast-iron treatment under a local Board than under Government administration.

2163. If you were teaching a school with an average attendance of 59, as you are now, on one side of the Waitaki River, and a man on the other side was teaching a similar school but was receiving £50 more than you in salary, would you consider that a fair system?—I should consider it was a very unhappy one, and that the system should be altered to enable us to receive equal salaries.

2164. How could you alter the conditions without altering the districts or bringing in a uniform scale?—I presume sufficient money could be voted to the Boards to enable them to pay sufficient salaries.

2165. If you pay under a capitation grant, the varying conditions in the different districts would remain, would they not? You could not increase the large schools in a district like Marlborough as, for instance, in a district like Wellington?—No, of course not.

2166. Then, would not the best teachers gravitate into the districts where the highest salaries were being paid?—They would do that under any scheme. I do not see that a colonial scale will alter that.

2167. Out of 1,675 schools in the colony, how many of them are under 35 in average attendance?—I think about seven hundred.

2168. No; there are 942, are there not?—No, I think not.

2169. Not according to the departmental return of the Minister of Education?—This return I have does not include the aided schools; probably yours does, and you are right.

2170. Then, you admit that a very large percentage of the schools of the colony are under 35 in average attendance?—A very large number indeed; more than one-third, I think.

2171. If, in the districts where the salaries now paid are so very low, particularly in that class of school, a uniform scale for the colony was adopted, would the teachers of these small schools where they are badly paid gravitate into the districts where they would, under a uniform scale, be receiving better salaries and equal salaries?—I do not think we can recognise districts; they would gravitate from the more poorly paid schools to the highly paid ones.

2172. There are seven hundred odd schools between 14 and 35 in average attendance, are there not?—Yes.

2173. That is a very large percentage indeed of the schools of the colony?—Yes; a little over one-third.

2174. If you took those schools only, at the present time great inequalities exist in the salaries paid in the different districts?—Yes.

2175. In the districts that are now able to pay fair salaries for such schools, they must expect to get an inferior type of teacher to the class of teacher they are able to get in districts where they pay better salaries?—Yes, that would follow, probably.

2176. Then, it is unfair, seeing that the ratepayers in the smaller districts of the colony pay for education in the same manner as ratepayers in the larger districts, while their children are taught by an inferior type of teacher?—I do not see how it affects the argument. You are asking the Government to come to your assistance in one way, and I am asking the Government in another way to do so.

2177. Could you suggest anything other than a uniform scale of salaries which would remove these inequalities?—Yes; I could suggest a Government grant.

2178. Altogether apart from the capitation grant?—It might or might not be apart from the capitation grant; I think we are the only body of servants dealt with on a capitation grant.

2179. You would suggest that this Commission should not be bound as they are by a £4 capitation grant, in making suggestions?—I did not know that it was the limited scope of the Commission's business—then it is only a matter of distribution.

2180. What is your salary at the present time?—£215.

2181. Have you compared that salary with the salary paid for a similar school in the other districts of the colony?—Yes.

2182. Could you tell the Commission how it compares with those salaries—take Auckland if you like—a school of 59 in attendance there?—I am aware that in all the other districts, those I have studied, that the Wellington salary paid for that class of school is very much higher, speaking generally.

2183. Do you know the number of schools in the Wellington District: are there not 147?—Probably.

2184. How many are there under 20 in average attendance—are there not forty?—My return gives the total number as 126, and eighteen under 20.

2185. How many between 20 and 35?—Eighteen, I think. I am not able to give you the exact figures.

2186. Is it not a fact that more than half the schools in the Wellington District are in the class under 35 in average attendance—seventy-seven out of 147 under 35 in average attendance?—I presume so.

2187. Taking the Wellington Board's regulations, I find that schools from 15 to 20 in attendance receive £70 a year as the maximum salary: do you think that is a fair salary for that class of school?—There is something to be said for it and something to be said against it: in the first place, that class of school is the stepping-stone for the male or female teacher who likes to go into the country; in the second place, it forms a sort of "letting-down ground" for men who have passed their prime, and who are no longer competent to teach the larger schools.

2188. Do you think £70 is a sufficient salary?—I would not like to say that it is a sufficient salary. As I said, there is something to be said for it.

2189. Take the next grade—20 to 25—the salary is £80: what is your opinion as to that salary for a sole teacher?—I think it is very low.

2190. The next grade—25 to 30—the salary is £100: have you taught in a school with an average attendance of 30?—Yes.

2191. What would be the roll-number, approximately?—Very little under 40.
2192. A man would have to teach 40 pupils, in all standards, in a primary school?—Yes.
2193. And for that the Wellington Education Board gives him £100 a year?—Yes.
2194. What is the number in your school?—About 75.
2195. And the average attendance is?—59.
2196. What standards do you teach?—From Standard III. upwards.
2197. What it the average attendance in those classes, approximately?—Between 30 and 35.
2198. I would like to compare the salaries paid to men in similar positions. A man gets rid of Standards I. and II. and the infants—what might be termed the drudgery—to a man, at any rate, and he is teaching 35 of an average in the standard classes, for which he receives a salary of £215 a year; whereas a man under the Wellington Board with an average attendance of 30 in the whole of the standards, of the primary classes, gets less than half: do you think that is fair?—There is no justice in human affairs.
2199. Do you consider that the Wellington scale deals fairly with the teachers when in a school with an average attendance of 30, and a sole teacher taking the whole of the primary classes and receiving a salary of £100 a year; whereas a man in a school of 59 pupils, and teaching the same number, but exclusive of Standards I. and II. and the infants, is paid twice as much?—It is no use asking me questions like that, because people are not paid according to the pupils they actually teach; the schools are classified.
2200. Do you think that is a fairly graduated scale, when a man receives more than twice as much as a man in sole charge of a school with an average attendance of 30?—My contention is that you do not make a fair comparison—you must compare that with higher schools, and the answer will come out. I do not say that difference in salary should exist.
2201. You think that the Wellington Board scale does not deal fairly with that type of teacher?—I do not think it deals very liberally with him. In schools not very much bigger three or four times as much is paid, and the duties of the headmaster are certainly very much lighter.
2202. I think you said you compared the salaries paid to a school having an average attendance of 59 with those paid in other districts of the colony, and also in other colonies in Australasia?—So far as other districts in the colony are concerned, I am aware that we are paid at a higher rate.
2203. What would be the salary for a school of 59 in Otago, where salaries are said to be very liberal, under the suggested scale?—£192, I think.
2204. Otago is said to be a district in which the teachers are very well paid; in fact, Otago has been held up frequently as a district where teachers are very highly paid: is it not so?—I do not know as to that.
2205. Would you be surprised to hear that it has been stated before the Commission on frequent occasions that the Otago teachers are very highly paid?—It might refer to their very highly paid men.
2206. It is not so. You stated that the New Zealand Educational Institute was not representative of the teachers of the colony, I think?—It is not in its deliberations, and the conclusions it arrives at at the annual council meetings.
2207. Take the year 1898: could you give the names of the representatives of the small schools?—Miss Sangster, Miss Sunley, and Mr. Warburton.
2208. Are those the only three?—These are the only ones I could trace.
Mr. Davidson: I fancy I was a representative also that year, and came from a school under 100 in attendance; if you inadvertently made a mistake in one case, probably you may have made one in another, and I simply wish to bring that point out.
2209. *Mr. Stewart.*] What is the staffing of your school?—An ex-pupil-teacher, a female.
2210. How long has she been out of her pupil-teachership?—Two or three years.
2211. Practically, to all intents and purposes, she is an assistant teacher?—Yes.
2212. What salary is she receiving at the present time?—£42 a year.
2213. Are you aware what an assistant teacher would receive in that class of school under the proposed alternative scale?—I think, £90.
2214. An increase of?—£48.
2215. So that, taking the total of the salaries paid to the two teachers in your school, instead of there being a decrease there would be a gain—the combined salaries would amount to more in the aggregate?—Yes, slightly more.
2216. Do you think that the female teachers under the Wellington Board scale are adequately remunerated?—No, especially in the case of ex-pupil-teachers.
2217. In the case of your assistant her salary would be more than doubled?—Yes.
2218. Do you think that is an act of justice?—It is no use talking "justice" to me, Mr. Stewart, after what I have told you.
2219. Your assistant gets £42 under the present scale; under the alternative scale her salary would be doubled: I wish to know whether you consider that is an act of justice?—Since you press me for my opinion, I consider that at the present time she is very hardly dealt with.
2220. Do you not think that, in the interests of a very large class of teachers, it is really necessary that there should be some revisal of the scale of payment to women teachers, no matter what authority that revisal emanates from?—Yes; of course, the lady teachers, and other teachers too, have recognised that, and they have made representations in the proper quarter to have that state of things altered, and I think there is every prospect of there being an alteration.
2221. I think I understood you to say that you had, at some time or other, expressed yourself in favour of a colonial scale: did you ever vote for the motion?—I cannot recollect.
2222. Did you ever vote against it?—I cannot say as to that.
2223. Were you present at the meeting of Wellington teachers that was held recently in order to consider this scale?—Yes.

2224. You took part in the proceedings?—Yes.

2225. At that meeting did you express any views similar to those you have expressed in evidence here?—I expressed very hostile opinions against this proposed scale.

2226. You are opposed to the principle of the colonial scale?—Yes.

2227. You stated in evidence that the Council of the New Zealand Educational Institute was not representative of the country teachers?—Not fairly representative.

2228. You do not happen to know the *personnel* of the Council this year?—No; I was away in the country.

2229. You are not aware that nearly one-half is composed of teachers of middle-sized and small schools?—I am extremely surprised to hear it.

2230. With regard to your status, you are not officially representative of the teachers of these small schools?—No; I am one who is quite in sympathy with the class.

2231. Do you think that witnesses who came before the Commission in, say, Blenheim, representatives of the Marlborough District, are country representatives, those representing small schools?—Marlborough has not many large schools.

2232. Do you think those witnesses would be representing the interests of the smaller schools?—I stated that the Council was not a thoroughly representative one.

2233. With regard to the method in which the representatives of the Council are elected, does that not secure proper representation of the country small schools?—No.

2234. Not if provision is made for country teachers to record their votes?—No; they cannot attend meetings of the Institute.

2235. They can vote by ballot or post?—It is the choice of two evils; a country teacher has no chance of getting one of his own class to represent him.

2236. Why not?—Because the difficulties of getting them to attend meetings are too great.

2237. Would not a country teacher be able to be nominated by post?—They would not take the trouble; there is no cohesion among the country teachers in the matter.

2238. How many large schools are there in the colony over 300 in attendance?—Seventy-six, I think I said.

2239. Do you think the votes from those schools could overpower the votes from other schools?—It depends on how many representatives they have at the conference.

2240. To whom do you refer as "they"?—The big schools.

2241. You admit that by far the largest proportion of the smaller schools in Wellington would be much benefited by the introduction of the alternative scale?—Yes; the salaries would be increased; the apparent monetary advantage would be greater: whether the ultimate benefit would be as great as now I am not prepared to say.

2242. Taking the teachers of Wellington as a whole—every teacher in the employ of the Board—would they or would they not be benefited by the scale submitted in evidence to the Commission?—I suppose there would be an increase all round in the money paid out to them.

2243. You stated you are not officially representative of the schools?—Yes.

2244. You are giving evidence as a private witness?—Yes; I am not an official representative.

2245. In your evidence-in-chief you made a statement like this—I took it down as it fell from your lips: "Instead of this, 'they' are tacking," &c. To whom do you refer as "they"?—I stated that £40 or £50 had been tacked on to the salaries of the higher-paid town masters. Assuming that scale is the scale of the Institute, then I mean the leaders of the Institute have benefited by the introduction of the scale.

Mr. Hogben stated that no one had knowledge of the scale, nor had it been made public until he had submitted it to the Commission and laid it on the table.

2246. *Mr. Stewart.*] You also stated that arguments had been carried on to the verge of tears, and that the feelings of the teachers had been worked upon?—Since the scale was instituted we have been recommended to fall in with it.

2247. Then, I may assume that I have removed from your mind misunderstandings and wrong impressions in reference to what you thought had been the action of a certain section of teachers?—You have removed the impression from my mind, or the impression has been removed, that the Inspector-General had consulted you in some respects as to whether the scheme would be an acceptable one or not.

2248. I have shown that a portion of your evidence has been given under a misconception?—No; if the scale was not before the Institute prior to the sitting of this Commission, it has been since.

2249. With regard to schools with an average attendance of from 15 to 20, did I understand you to say that they were suitable for teachers, men who had grown old and infirm?—I mean men who are not up to the strain of the active work demanded in the teaching of a large school.

2250. You think these smaller schools are a refuge for these teachers?—Yes.

2251. Do you not think that the country districts should receive efficient teachers and efficient education?—I know many things that should be done, but that are not done; I am not arguing on the question of abstract justice.

2252. If good and efficient teachers can be provided for these schools, do you not think the Commission should try and get them?—I do not know what the Commission should do, or should not do.

2253. If you were a parent living in one of those country districts, would you not wish the school to be officered by a good and efficient teacher?—I think the schools in those districts are manned by good teachers. The question is more one of individual tuition than class tuition: you can sit by the side of a pupil and guide his or her hand if you choose.

2254. You say you have charge of Standard III. and up to Standard VII.?—Yes.

2255. How many children have you to teach in those standards?—I would like to consult my book before answering—I should say from 28 to 35.

2256. Then the average would be about 32?—Yes.

2257. Take 32 from your average attendance for the whole school of 59 and it leaves?—27.

2258. Twenty-seven pupils for your assistant to teach?—Yes.

2259. Do you not think she is receiving far too inadequate a salary for teaching that number of children?—Yes, I have said so.

2260. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You are not a representative of the teachers?—Schools of our class have no representative, and could not get one.

2261. Did the Institute meet and select representatives to give evidence before the Commission?—Yes.

2262. You were not selected?—Yes, I was.

2263. By the Institute?—Yes.

2264. Were you present at the meeting?—Yes.

2265. How many were present in all?—I cannot tell you; it was one of the largest meetings I have seen held.

2266. Were there twenty present?—I should say many more: probably forty or fifty.

2267. Have you been an active member of the Institute for any length of time?—Yes.

2268. With regard to these questions of adopting a colonial scale, you have not taken sufficient interest in the matter to know how you voted or whether you voted at all?—It is many years ago since I voted as a member of the Council. I have been always under the impression that in Wellington we stood to lose considerably by the adoption of a colonial scale, and, if I did vote for it, I did so simply as a matter of abstract justice to the poorer-paid teachers in the outlying districts, and we were all prepared to sacrifice something.

2269. Nevertheless the motion was carried by a majority in favour of the adoption of a colonial scale; was the motion not carried at the local meeting to support a colonial scale?—I cannot recollect whether a vote was taken.

2270. Will you say a vote was not taken?—No, I will not say that.

2271. You are not taking sufficient interest in the affairs of the Institute to remember whether such important matters of that nature were discussed or not?—If you told me the meeting that you refer to I might remember.

2272. A meeting held a few weeks ago; however, with regard to the payments by grades instead of by units, are you aware that in the case of the majority of Boards in this colony teachers are paid by units and not by grades?—I was not aware of it.

2273. You would not deny that such is the case if it was stated so?—No, certainly not.

2274. In your opinion, are these Boards making a mistake when they adopt the system of payment by units instead of by grades?—I should say any Board that adopted the method of payment of teachers by units instead of by grades was not adopting the best method of payment.

2275. In regard to your statement as to influence and pressure being brought to bear on Boards in order to establish aided schools, do you consider such influences would be intensified if a colonial scale of salaries was adopted?—Yes.

2276. In what way?—The Boards, not having control of their own funds, will take less interest in that which passes merely through their hands to pay to others than if they had the money to do with as they wished.

2277. Suppose there was a stipulation that no school should be established below a certain number in attendance, would not Boards then be able to resist that pressure?—Stipulations are easily got round; I think Boards should use their discretion.

2278. Is it not a fact that in some districts Boards are more liberal in the establishment of small schools than what they are in others?—I object to the use of the word "liberal"; they are more foolish in building the schools, I admit.

2279. Suppose the Otago Board was as liberal as the Taranaki or Wellington Board, would Otago be able to pay the same salaries as are paid at the present time?—It naturally follows, the more small schools there are established in a district the less will be the salaries paid in that district.

2280. With regard to Boards: you consider that men of intellectual calibre would not seek seats on Education Boards in the event of a colonial scale being adopted?—I said the more you diminished Boards' responsibilities the more it would lead to their deterioration.

2281. How often does the Wellington Board require to draw up a new scale of salaries? I infer from your reply that, if the responsibility of drawing up a scale of salaries is withdrawn from Education Boards, men of intellectual calibre would not be inclined to come forward and take seats on the Boards?—I said it must lead to deterioration.

2282. What is the difference between thirteen Boards drawing up a scale of salaries and the Legislature drawing up a scale which is to be adopted by the thirteen Boards, if the money comes from the Government and the Boards allocate it: how will it lessen their power or influence?—If the Boards' administration of funds—take any body of men—is cut down from a £4 basis, with all privileges, to a basis of 11s. 3d., with the possibility of further reductions, the tendency of the Boards would be towards deterioration.

2283. You think that the Boards should be allowed to trench on the maintenance fund for building purposes?—I do not see that follows.

2284. Supposing, for example, that a colonial scale drawn up and adopted by the Legislature is exactly identical with the scale of the Wellington Board, or the scales of the thirteen Boards in the colony, what difference will it make?—In the first place, it is a misconception; in the second place, the Wellington Board might wish to alter their scale to-morrow in order to suit varying circumstances.

2285. Are there likely to be exceptionally varying circumstances in Wellington any more than in other districts?—I am not called upon to prophesy what will happen in Wellington. The

Wellington Board finds now that it has an excess of ex-pupil-teachers, and it must take steps to find an outlet for them. That might necessitate the recasting of their scale to-morrow.

2286. You do not wish to infer that the Wellington Board, or any other Board, has funds other than provided by the Government?—No.

2287. Your opposition, I gather, to a colonial scale is because in cases such as yours the teachers would lose a considerable sum of money: is your policy not, after all, a "breeches-pocket" one: you would not be so hostile to a colonial scale if your salary was increased?—No doubt, if you offered me an increase in salary such as some gentlemen in the service of the Board are getting, it might smooth my acceptance to a colonial scale, but I would still prefer to be under the Board's jurisdiction.

2288. *The Chairman.*] You are satisfied with the scale of the Wellington Board?—I am more than satisfied.

2289. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to the appointment of teachers, do you consider such appointments should be in the hands of Boards irrespective of Committees?—I did not say so.

2290. What did you say?—I said that the initiative should spring from the Inspectors, confirmation from the Boards, and refusal or acceptance from the local Committee.

2291. Supposing the teacher elected is a stranger, how can the opposition spring from the Committee?—I mean to say that the local Committee should show reason to the Board why the appointee of the Board should not be accepted.

2292. But is it not a fact, sometimes, that the appointee of the Board is a stranger to the Committee?—Yes; but the Committee should be compelled to find something against the appointee before opposing the appointment, or else should be in the position of accepting the Board's confirmation.

2293. With regard to teachers of the Home-country, you did not hear the evidence given yesterday by Mr. Joplin, who stated that a teacher from New Zealand had considerable difficulty—in fact, it was almost impossible for him—in obtaining a position in the Mother-country. In your evidence you said something about it being, perhaps, better for teachers to "pull up their stakes" and go Home?—Well, of course, all New Zealand teachers are not able to get appointments here; I could run over a list of twelve who could not get appointments. You have to judge of other things than simply academic status.

2294. You have been twenty-five years in the service of the Wellington Education Board—going on for twenty-six years—and you are in a school with a falling attendance, as I see from the report?—No, my school is not falling in attendance; it is one of the steadiest schools in New Zealand; it has never risen in attendance very much, and never fallen.

2295. You advocate the payment of a bonus on certificates?—Yes.

2296. Are you aware how many Boards pay these bonuses?—No.

2297. Are you in favour of the fine that is suggested in the proposed scale? Decidedly not.

2298. Is a fine in such a case not a bonus?—I simply ask that some slight inducement should be held out to all our teachers to improve their educational standard, apart from all the chances of getting bigger schools; I simply mean to pursue their studies.

2299. Would you advocate reduction on teachers when they become less efficient through getting up in years, or through laziness?—No; it seems to me we are confusing two matters—I am talking of literary proficiency, and not ability to keep a school.

2300. Do you consider literary attainments qualify a teacher for the performance of his duties rather than efficiency as judged by Inspector's marks?—I did not say so. I say, take two men and put them in charge of schools, and the man of higher literary attainments must have a better influence over the school than the man with lower attainments.

2301. What encouragement would you give to a teacher to conduct his school as efficiently as possible in order to get to the highest grade?—He gets encouragement in being promoted to the large schools.

2302. Would not the same thing apply in regard to literary attainments?—No.

2303. Why not?—For the reason that a man may have high literary attainments, and yet be a poor manager of a school. What you want in the large school is more of what I might call a school "jockey," not exactly a man possessed of only high literary attainments.

2304. *Mr. Hill.*] Do I understand you to say that if you take away some of the duties of Education Boards, it follows that such Boards will deteriorate in quality?—I do not think I said their duties—their responsibilities, I said.

2305. Well, their responsibilities, then?—I think that would be the effect.

2306. I understand it is one of the reasons why you oppose the principle of a colonial scale; you do not want to see the functions of Boards limited?—No; I wish to see their *personnel* as high as it is at the present time.

2307. You think that each Education Board might well be left to formulate its own policy?—Decidedly.

2308. You recognise, of course, that there is a great diversity existing in New Zealand in the matter of the payment of teachers' salaries?—Yes.

2309. You recognise also that the diversity is in consequence of there being different sized schools in the several districts?—Yes; I attribute it to the paucity of children in those districts—the preponderance of small schools over large schools.

2310. Do you think it would be a better plan to take, say, the best paid districts in New Zealand at the present time, and pay a capitation grant in each of the other districts, so as to raise the salaries of the teachers in those districts to the salaries received in the better paid districts?—I think it might be done.

2311. You think that the best paid districts ought not to come down to the average for New Zealand?—No, I do not think so.

2312. You recognise that the teachers in the smaller districts are at the present time receiving salaries which are not really commensurate to the work they are called upon to do?—I say nothing about the work they are called upon to do.

2313. If a man receive £70 in the Grey District, for doing the same work as a man in the Wellington District who receives a salary of £120, are those salaries commensurate for the work performed?—No; I think the teacher in the Grey District should be levelled up to the teacher in the Wellington District.

2314. Would you suggest that the two salaries should be added together in order to make the mean, or would you, as you say, raise the salary of the teacher in the Grey District?—I would raise the salary of the teacher in the Grey up to the level of the Wellington District.

2315. Would you suggest that the salaries received in the best paid districts at the present time should be taken as an index for the payment of teachers' salaries generally?—Yes, I think so.

2316. You would not lower any salaries, except, perhaps, those in the best paid districts?—I cannot say that any of the salaries are too high.

2317. Will you be good enough to look at the staffing of the Mount Cook Kindergarten School and compare the staffing in that school with the staffing under the proposed scale?—I would like to say that I purposely have not touched upon the question of staffing at all; it does not occur in my evidence.

2318. In a school of 391, do you see that the staffing gives a principal five assistants and five pupil-teachers?—Yes.

2319. And you see the salaries proposed also?—Yes.

2320. The lady principal is the only one who will suffer through the five other assistants coming in. One lady teacher who receives £125 would receive £165?—Yes.

2321. Four other lady teachers would receive salaries of £125, £110, £95, and £80, respectively?—Yes.

2322. From your knowledge as a teacher, then, do you think that the proposed staffing is better than the staff at present in the school?—You have taken a particular school, which you should not have taken. I think it is a school the Wellington Board uses largely for the training of its teachers.

2323. I will take any school you like—a girl's school, for instance. I want to know would not the school be better staffed with five assistant teachers to help in the training of the other teachers?—It would not leave them much room.

2324. Do you mean to tell me that the proposed staffing—five assistant teachers—is not better than the staffing which obtains at present in the school?—I would prefer you to ask Mrs. Francis. I would not like to give an opinion on that particular school, for I did not come here prepared to discuss the question of staffing.

2325. Would the proposed staffing strengthen the school?—I never heard the school was weak in that respect.

2326. Do you think that the salaries proposed to the assistants of that school, or any school of that class, are too large?—I have not looked at the matter from the assistants' point of view.

2327. Would you pay men and women equal salaries, assuming all conditions to be the same—capacity, the number of children under instruction, responsibility, and efficiency?—Certainly not.

2328. Will you state your reasons?—To my mind two circumstances have always governed the question of wages—one is the law of supply and demand, the other is the cost of living; and no one can deny that the cost of living in the case of a man is very much more than the cost of living in the case of a woman, especially so in the case of a married man with a family.

2329. Supposing you went to a lady typist to get some matter typewritten, would you expect her to charge you less than the folio rate?—No.

2330. Why not?—Because, in that case, the ordinary rule of supply and demand comes in, and it is the market price.

2331. Then, is not a woman teacher entitled to the market price for the work done?—I gave my reasons before.

2332. You prefer the principle of a fixed salary?—Yes.

2333. Are you receiving a fixed salary now?—I suppose it is not altogether fixed.

2334. It is according to the Board's scale?—Yes.

2335. According to the present scale?—Yes.

2336. What is your salary?—£215.

2337. Is that according to the Board's scale for a school of 59 in attendance?—Yes.

2338. You would be a great loser under the proposed scale?—Yes.

2339. What would your salary be under the proposed scale?—£180 or £185.

2340. You do not object to losing part of your salary if there is to be an equal sacrifice on the part of others?—I think every man hates to lose a part of his salary, but it would certainly console me to know that it went into the pockets of the poorer paid teachers, and did not enrich those who are better paid

2341. Under the proposed scale, are not the majority of the salaries to be raised?—Yes.

2342. The general average will be improved?—Yes.

2343. Do you object to that?—Yes, decidedly, if those richer than myself are participating in the gain, instead of in the sacrifice.

2344. If the salaries of assistant teachers were improved, would you object then?—That is not my point; I object to give up a considerable part of my salary while those who are better paid than myself are not giving up anything.

2345. If the average number of certificated teachers in New Zealand are benefited under the proposed scale, would you disapprove of it?—I would disapprove of it if those who are more highly paid than myself took no part in the sacrifice.

2346. You say you do not think the majority of the teachers in New Zealand have been consulted on the question of a colonial scale?—If the majority of the schools had been consulted, this particular scheme would not have been the emanation of their conference.

2347. You are aware that this Commission has been all over the colony taking evidence?—Yes.

2348. Are you aware that the teachers have been invited to give evidence?—Yes.

2349. Were you debarred from giving evidence here?—No.

2350. Are you a representative of the Institute?—No.

2351. If the other teachers have not been represented and they will not come, who is to blame?—I suppose they are to blame.

2352. If the results are not satisfactory, whose fault is it—if the teachers do not come forward—the Commission's fault or the fault of the teachers?—I do not blame the Commission, it is the fault of the teachers, no doubt. In England it is the same thing, they lack the cohesion necessary for action; they are too broken-hearted.

2353. I understand that you are against the Committees making recommendation on behalf of teachers?—Yes.

2354. Supposing you wanted a pair of boots, would you go by the recommendation of the bootmaker, or would you abide by your own choice?—I should be guided by own opinion of the man's honesty and my opinion of the appearance of the boots.

2355. Do you think School Committees are interested in obtaining good and honest men as teachers?—Yes, they are decidedly interested.

2356. Do you think they would be likely, in such a case, to select an indifferent man in preference to a very good man if they were wanting a teacher?—I not only know it to be likely, but I know it to be absolutely true that they do so.

2357. You have found that these men, given responsibility, will abuse it even when it is against the interests of their own children?—Yes, that is so.

2358. Could you give examples?—I think that is calling on me to do too much.

2359. *Mr. Weston.*] Will you give me your opinion upon pupil-teacher teaching?—It all depends on the year of the pupil-teacher's life you take: given a good training, and particularly a good kindergarten training, for two or three years, I think in the latter part of a pupil-teacher's career he or she would be an efficient teacher.

2360. But under other circumstances, what then?—Then a pupil-teacher cannot be as efficient in the early part of his or her career as a teacher who has had such a training as I have emphasized the need of.

2361. It has been said, by one witness at any rate, that a pupil-teacher has not the control of the higher standards, and that he is not always qualified to fill the position of infant-teacher: do you confirm that statement?—The personal element so much comes in; there is the question, also, of the girl's training: given a well-trained girl, I think she would be competent in the latter part of her career to manage the lower classes in the school up to the Third Standard, and, possibly, a small Fourth Standard also.

2362. Do you think that pupil-teachers under the present system have the best opportunities for learning theory and practice?—No, I do not.

2363. What improvement do you think could be affected in that matter?—Probably by the establishment of training-schools.

2364. Do you think that pupil-teachers, in justice to themselves and the children alike, should be allowed to teach all day?—No, I do not.

2365. How would you apportion the school day?—About half and half.

2366. If there be an evil a remedy must be found: I want you to tell whether, in your opinion, employing teachers all day and expecting them to study at night is an evil?—Yes, I should say it is an evil.

2367. Then, if a pupil-teacher is employed in school all day, and has to study after hours, does it not follow that the children she is employed to instruct may suffer?—I think they may suffer; I have not noticed many cases where I think they would do so.

2368. Do you not think that a boy or girl, especially a girl whose nerves are more highly strung, having to study after hours, must come to the school somewhat jaded?—Yes; I think that naturally follows.

2369. Then, I suppose, if it were not a question of money, it would be, in your opinion, better to have adult teachers in all our schools?—I would increase the proportion of adult teachers.

2370. To what extent?—I did not think I would be questioned on that point, and so I did not come prepared to answer the question.

2371. What class of school do you think a sole female teacher is competent to take charge of?—Schools of an average attendance up to 30 or 40.

2372. You think a female teacher could manage all the standards in such a school?—Yes.

2373. You think she should and would be able not only to teach the standards, but to control the country boys who would be placed under her?—Yes, I think so, and I know it is largely done.

2374. That being the case, if a lady can teach a school up to 30 of an attendance, should she not receive, in the particular school, the salary that a man would receive if he was in charge of a similar school?—No, I do not think so.

2375. Do you think that there should be a minimum salary payable alike to male and female teachers?—No; I should always hold that it would be right to differentiate, on account of the extra expense a man is always put to.

2376. With regard to the functions of Education Boards, I think I understood you to say that you were in favour of the present system of payment of salaries?—Yes, all things considered, I think I prefer it.

2377. I presume in the evidence you have given you base it upon the accepted principle, which lawyers, at any rate, understand, that the presumption is that what is right will be done, and therefore it is to be presumed the Boards throughout the colony will divide their capitation grant fairly and equitably amongst the teachers in their own particular district?—Yes, I think they would certainly do that.

2378. That is your principle?—Yes.

2379. With regard to future uncertainty—you touched upon that point: do you consider that there would be more uncertainty under the present system than under a colonial scale?—I think there would be less uncertainty—that is to say, there would be more certainty of generous treatment from Boards than under a colonial scale.

2380. I mean, whether in the course of time the Legislature might not reduce the capitation grant, and so bring about the uncertainty that, even under the present system, exists?—The Legislature might at any time reduce the grant, as they did once before.

2381. You object to the original and alternative scales of salaries which are proposed, do you not?—Yes.

2382. And you instance your own case as an illustration?—Yes.

2383. If you were asked to frame a scale of salaries, how would you commence?—I am not attempting to do that now.

2384. You are not in the position to enunciate principles that would control you in the preparation of a scale?—No; I have not studied the question of the construction of a scale. I come here as a critic, not as a constructor.

2385. Can you enunciate any principles that you think should actuate the framers of a scale applicable to the whole of the colony?—You must, of course, have a minimum salary.

2386. What should the amount of that minimum salary be per annum?—£100.

2387. As you say that females should not receive the same salaries as males, what proportion of the £100 would you allocate to a lady teacher?—80 per cent. or 90 per cent.

2388. Then, in dealing with lady teachers, in cases where something beyond the minimum salary was payable, what percentage would you debit a lady teacher with from a man's salary?—I would make a reduction of 10 per cent. or 15 per cent.

2389. Is there any other point upon which you would lay stress in the preparation of a colonial scale?—The question of the maximum salary.

2390. What amount should that be?—That would depend on the finances I had at my disposal.

2391. But disregarding finances?—I think it is impossible to do so in framing a scale of salaries.

2392. I want you to tell me what would be righteous and fair?—I cannot dissociate salaries from ability to pay.

2393. Taking the £4 capitation grant, what would you say should be the maximum salary, since you put it in that way, or, rather, £3 9s. 8d., leaving 11s. 3d. for incidentals?—I should say £300 a year would be a fair maximum salary.

2394. That is for a male teacher?—Yes.

2395. And what for a female teacher?—The same percentage as before.

2396. Do you find any difficulty in obtaining pupil-teachers?—This Board apparently finds no difficulty.

2397. Would you advocate any departure from the present rate of pay to pupil-teachers, and if so, what salary do you think they should receive?—I do not think the present rate of pay has much to condemn it. I think it matters not so much what you pay a candidate at the start, provided you hold out to him reasonable hope of obtaining a fair salary afterwards.

2398. Do you think, more especially in the case of male pupil-teachers, that the curriculum—the hard work—enters into a boy's calculations when he is at an age to come forward as a pupil-teacher?—I do not know about the hard work. I think there is a feeling among boys that they do not want to grow up as "old schoolmasters."

2399. So far as that is concerned, do you think there is a future for pupil-teachers in this colony?—I do not think there is a very bright one for them.

2400. Do you think there are too many pupil-teachers employed in the colony?—Not too many male pupil-teachers.

2401. I read even so lately as last night the opinion of specialists that hereafter the majority of teachers will be female teachers: is that your opinion?—I am inclined towards that opinion.

2402. Do you not think, therefore, that the risk Boards of Education take in receiving young girls as pupil-teachers is altogether a mistake, and is one of the causes producing the present effect?—It is one of the causes producing the effect that we are likely, in the future, to have our schools officered by women; 95 per cent. of the schools in Massachusetts are in the hands of women.

2403. Do you think that ladies are competent to teach Standards IV., V., VI., in our town schools?—I do not think so.

2404. Why?—I do not think they have sufficient controlling-power.

THURSDAY, 27TH JUNE, 1901.

Examination of J. J. PILKINGTON continued.

2405. *Mr. Hogben.*] I think you agreed with the remarks of Sir Henry Craik regarding the harm done by excessive competition?—Yes.

2406. Do you think that instead of competitive scholarships, which entitle pupils to free education and something more in secondary schools, it would be better to have what I might call qualify-

ing scholarships, so that if pupils reached a certain standard they should be entitled to free education?—Yes, I think that would be a decided improvement.

2407. You know that Sir Henry Craik is secretary of the Scotch Education Board?—I did not exactly know his official standing.

2408. Have you also read his remarks upon manual and technical education?—No, I have not.

2409. You are not aware he is very strongly in favour of manual and technical instruction in primary schools, and that he gave his opinions as evidence in 1893?—No, I am not aware.

2410. You are not aware that he is of the opinion that in the rural districts of Scotland just as good provision should be made for manual and technical instruction as in the manufacting districts; this opinion of his you will find in the report of the Royal Commission in 1893?—I was not aware of it.

2411. Are you aware that Somersetshire and Wiltshire are said to be two of the counties in which both manual and technical instruction is carried out most thoroughly, and that in the schools of those counties such instruction takes the form of practical instruction in rural subjects?—Yes; that would to some extent meet my views.

2412. Is it proposed to introduce technical education into the schools in New Zealand?—It seems to me to be proposed all round.

2413. Where is it proposed?—Page 3, section 3.

2414. Do you not recognise that wood-work may be a subject of hand-and-eye training, quite apart from the training necessary for carpenter's trade?—I should say it would be a very retrograde step to take from a boy his drawing-pencil, which is *facile princeps* of all tools, and put him to handle a cross-cut saw, a hammer, or a jack-plane.

2415. You think that the graphite pencil fell down ready-made out of heaven. How long have you studied this question?—Every since I have had the power to study.

2416. Have you tried it in practical education yourself in school?—No.

2417. Are you aware that the use of the hand in the treatment of solid forms reacts on the co-ordinating functions of the brain?—I presume it does.

2418. I am speaking of wood-work as a subject of manual instruction for the simple purpose of training the hand: what is your opinion?—I would still maintain that you cannot train the hand so well as you could do by the use of the drawing-pencil.

2419. Does the drawing-pencil train the sense of touch in the conception of the idea of solidity?—If children take model-drawing I think it does; it certainly trains the sense of touch most minutely.

2420. In connection with the idea of solidity, will you be surprised to hear that there is not a psychologist in the world who holds that opinion?—Yes, I am surprised to hear it.

2421. You said inquiry should be made into the question of technical education in primary schools: I suppose you mean manual instruction in primary schools?—I am speaking of technical education.

2422. There is none proposed. You said that an inquiry should be made before it is introduced in New Zealand: are you aware that a good deal of inquiry has been made?—No.

2423. Are you aware of Mr. Riley's report published two or three years ago?—I have read it.

2424. Does that not amount to inquiry?—It is a report, not an inquiry by a large body of experts to sift evidence, a body like this Commission.

2425. Have you read the report of the inquiry conducted by the Irish Royal Commission on practical and manual instruction in elementary schools in Ireland, in 1898, the most valuable mass of evidence ever obtained?—No, I have not.

2426. Are you aware that manual instruction, including instruction in wood-work, was proposed to be introduced into the rural schools in Ireland, where the conditions were fairly promising, such as those we have in a country like New Zealand?—No.

2427. Are you not aware that that report was carefully gone through, and that that Commission took evidence in regard to rural districts in other parts of the world besides Ireland?—I am not aware of it. I know there was a Commission set up to take evidence, and they presented a report about rural schools, and I was astonished at the barrenness of the report, and the paltry proposals made.

2428. You are not referring to the Commission I mean?—Possibly not.

2429. Are you aware that an abstract of the report was pubished by the Education Department in New Zealand?—No, I am not.

2430. It was a special report, No. 1, 1899?—No, I cannot say I have read it. If it was sent to me, probably I did; but I do not remember.

2431. Your next point was in regard to salaries and the principle of promotion of teachers by grade and not by units. Take a case like this: supposing a man had 50 pupils in average attendance, what would be the maximum salary payable to him under this Board?—£215.

2432. Supposing his attendance fell to 49, what would his salary be?—£175.

2433. How much would he lose for one unit?—£40.

2434. Then, do you not think it would be less hardship, when the loss had to be incurred, that it should proceed by units instead of grades?—No.

2435. Would it not be a great hardship that for the loss of one child from his school the head-teacher would lose £40 from his salary?—No; of course, there are hardships under any scale, but I prefer the classification by 20's and 25's rather than by units; it avoids the scrambling after units.

2436. Do you not think there would be a scramble after the £40 when the attendance had reached 49 and only another one was wanted?—There might be a scramble after that one, but not after every one.

2437. Do you not think that a good deal of hardship, by the introduction of a new scale, would be done away with by conserving vested rights—that present holders of positions should have their salaries maintained at the present figure?—Yes, I do.

2438. It would allow time to transfer them to places where the salaries corresponded with their present salaries, would it not?—Certainly, if you had some assurance of systematic promotion.

2439. You would not take the power of promotion from the Boards?—No.

2440. If such were the case, how would the Boards have less authority?—I think we endeavoured to elucidate that question yesterday.

2441. Then, I understand that you give the same answer now as you gave yesterday?—Yes.

2442. May I take it that you practically represent schools from 40 to 100 in attendance, or, rather, that you speak for them, as, I understand, you appear to a certain extent on your own responsibility?—Something like that.

2443. Have you estimated the average salaries paid to the head-teachers of those schools in the Wellington District?—I do not recognise average salaries in the Wellington District.

2444. There are twenty-eight teachers, or something like that, and I want to get at the average salary?—We want the average scale salary, not the average individual salary.

2445. You are not aware that the average salary paid in the Wellington District for schools of that class, between 40 and 100, is £196?—I am not aware of it.

2446. Are you aware what the scale salary would be in this district for those schools?—£175.

2447. £160 to £195. Well, take schools in the Wellington District with from 40 to 100 in attendance, what is the average salary the scale would give?—I have not found that out.

2448. Then, how can you criticize a scale of salaries unless you know what it is you are comparing? You cannot construct a scheme without averages?—No, I suppose not.

2449. Are you aware of what the average salary under the proposed colonial scale is?—I have it in your own figures, about £160.

2450. Supposing we come to a few individual cases: are you aware that there is a school of 41 with a salary to the headmaster of £195 in the Wellington District?—Yes.

2451. What would be the maximum salary payable under the scale?—£175.

2452. £20 less?—Yes.

2453. There is another school, salary £205: what is the salary payable to that school of 44 in attendance, head-teacher D1 certificate, according to the Wellington scale, page 9 of the regulations, schools between 35 and 50?—£175.

2454. Then, he is being paid £30 in excess of the Wellington scale?—Yes.

2455. Have you gone through it to see how many of the schools you represent are being paid above the Wellington scale?—It is not my business to do so.

2456. You have not examined it; you represent a certain class of schools, and yet you have not recognised or compared the existing state of affairs with the scale of the Board?—I repeat it is not my business to do so.

2457. Have you examined one scale against another?—Yes.

2458. What is the average salary payable to Wellington schools under the Wellington scale?—It is plainly set out in the scale.

2459. You would like to see the salaries of all classes of teachers in the different districts raised to the highest existing scale under which salaries are paid?—Yes; that would be a natural desire on the part of all teachers.

2460. Would you favour a proposal to give the Boards the means of doing that, taking every class of teacher by itself?—Yes, I should certainly support that.

2461. I presume you know that the conditions in the different districts vary a good deal?—Yes.

2462. Supposing you were considering the payment of teachers in schools from 1 to 9, below 10 in attendance, do you know that the number of such schools varies very considerably in the different districts? Marlborough has thirty-nine such schools?—Yes.

2463. You would have to make provision for Marlborough to pay for thirty-nine schools, whereas for South Canterbury you would not have to make any provision at all?—Yes, I understand.

2464. There would be variations throughout?—Yes.

2465. And the same thing would apply in schools of 14 in attendance: Auckland would have to pay for twenty-nine, and so on, right down to Marlborough which has six, and Taranaki four?—Yes.

2466. You would also have to make provision wherever there was any considerable amount of variation?—Yes.

2467. For schools of 15 to 19, and 20 to 35, you would have to give the Boards enough to pay such salaries?—Yes.

2468. Then, would that not be the same thing as paying them on a colonial scale?—Yes, I presume so.

2469. The principle is the same, is it not? We should have to distribute enough for the Boards to pay?—This is so.

2470. Then it would be a colonial scale to Boards to allow them to make payments?—Yes.

2471. The only difference is that the Boards would not then be compelled to pay salaries in that particular way; they would have the money to do so, but would not be compelled to pay salaries in any particular way?—Not legally, but morally, I suppose, they would be.

2472. Are you aware that certain of the Boards could have paid a scale closely approximating to that scale, at all events, in a large number of their schools before, and they did not do so?—I know that some small appropriations were made—I did not know that they were very large.

2473. You think that Boards would pay on a colonial scale if they were given the money to do so?—Yes, I think they would be compelled to do so.

2474. Do you think they have shown any tendency to do so in the past?—Yes, I think so.

2475. Do you think the appointment of teachers should be left in the hands of Boards?—Yes.
2476. *The Chairman.*] Have you looked carefully over the proposed colonial scale?—Yes; more particularly as it affects schools of my own class.
2477. To ascertain the way in which it will affect teachers in medium-sized schools like your own?—Yes.
2478. Generally, how will it affect those teachers?—They will suffer a very decided reduction.
2479. Take one school for instance, the Mangatainoka School, average attendance 160; the salary of the head-teacher, Mr. Chatwin, is £265: how much will he receive under the proposed scale—his school is in the Forty-mile Bush?—He will get £240.
2480. He suffers a reduction of £25?—Yes.
2481. Do you know Mr. Chatwin personally?—Yes.
2482. Is he an old, inefficient teacher, or is he a young and efficient teacher?—He is a young, smart man.
2483. I presume, one of the best teachers in the district?—I should not be surprised to hear that he was.
2484. Take the Pahiatua School, average attendance 228; the headmaster receives a salary of £285: what will be his salary under the proposed colonial scale?—£257 12s.
2485. He will suffer a reduction of about £27?—Yes.
2486. Do you know him personally?—Yes.
2487. Is he an old or an efficient teacher?—Certainly, so far as I have heard, he is supposed to be a very competent teacher; he is not an old man, but a man in the full vigour of life and manhood.
2488. Is he a good, active, experienced teacher?—Yes.
2489. Take the case of the Kaitawa School, average attendance 41; salary paid to the head-teacher, £235: what reduction will he suffer under the proposed scale?—He will suffer a reduction of £74.
2490. In the case of the Makakahi School, average attendance 65; the headmaster receives a salary of £225, or £205 without house allowance: what salary will he receive under the proposed colonial scale—that is, without house allowance?—£185.
2491. He will suffer a reduction of £20?—Yes.
2492. Again, take the case of the headmaster of the Pongaroa School, one of the schools in the back blocks, average attendance 14—it is set down at 14 in the report—but it is nearly 100 at the present time——
Mr. Hogben: For the March quarter the attendance was 37.
2493. *The Chairman.*] That master receives a salary of £175: what salary will he receive under the proposed scale?—He would lose £100.
2494. Do you know him?—Yes.
2495. Is he a young and inefficient teacher, or an inexperienced teacher?—He is quite young, and, so far as I know, he has had a long Wellington experience at one of the town schools, and he has a high reputation for skill at the School of Design.
2496. Take the case of the Taueru School, which has already been referred to, the number on the roll is 46, and the salary of the headmaster is £205: what salary would he receive under the suggested scale?—He would receive £166, a reduction of £39.
2497. Do you know him?—No, I do not.
2498. Then, again, the Hamua School, the attendance is 41, and the salary paid to the head-master is £215: what reduction will he undergo under the proposed scale?—His salary would then be £161, a reduction of £54.
2499. Do you know that teacher?—Yes.
2500. Is he a good teacher or an inefficient teacher?—I simply know he is a young man who has been some time in the service of the Board.
2501. So far as you are aware he has a good record?—Yes, so far as I know.
2502. I will take the case of a lady-teacher in charge of the Rongomai School, average attendance, 29; salary, £143 15s.: what salary would she receive under the suggested scale?—£128.
2503. She also would suffer a reduction in salary?—Yes, that is so.
2504. Take the case of a school that has only been established a few years, a school near Masterton—Te Ore Ore; the average attendance is 55, and the headmaster receives a salary of £215: what would his salary be under the suggested scale?—£175; he would suffer a reduction of £40.
2505. Do you know him?—No, I do not.
2506. Every one, without exception, of the medium-sized schools will suffer reduction under the proposed scale?—Yes, that is right.
2507. And a very severe reduction at that?—Yes.
2508. What would the percentage be?—From one-fifth to one-sixth of their salaries—about 20 per cent.
2509. Have you noticed whether the teachers in city schools are likely to suffer any serious reduction under the suggested scale?—I have not noticed; I think they would receive a slight increase.
2510. If reductions are necessary in order to build up the salaries of underpaid assistants, what salaries, in your opinion, can best afford that reduction?—If we have to suffer reduction the holders of the highest salaries should bear a proportionate share in such reductions as are made; they should participate equally.
2511. Is that the case under the proposed scheme; are they participating in the reductions?—No, it is not so.
2512. You were asked a question in regard to one of your teachers, whom you say is an ex-pupil-teacher: is that lady teacher certificated?—Yes; she holds a D certificate.

2513. Has she applied for any of our country schools?—I am not quite sure; I think she applied for the Roseneath School.

2514. Has she parents residing in the locality?—No; her parents reside in Christchurch.

2515. Her salary is £42 a year, is it not?—Yes.

2516. You say you are only aware of her having applied in one instance for another school?—Yes. She may have applied in two instances; I am not sure, I think I should say two.

2517. Is there a prospect of that girl getting a better position if she applied for a country school, and got a house, too?—Yes; but I very much doubt if she would apply.

2518. Are you aware of any gross anomalies in connection with the city schools, where the salaries do not correspond with the amount of work teachers have to perform? Do you think there are any underpaid assistants there?—As I said yesterday, I have not really studied the question from the assistants' point of view; I saw that teachers of all classes were being represented by chosen individuals, and I did not think it necessary for me to go outside my own limits and study other aspects of the case.

2519. Taking the case of a large city school with an attendance of 700 or 800, the headmaster receiving a salary of over £400 a year: do you think £100 in that case would be sufficient remuneration to the assistant teacher in charge of the Seventh Standard, undoubtedly the most competent teacher in the school, and doing the heaviest work of the school?—It certainly seems a very low salary.

2520. Would you consider it an anomaly for that teacher, in charge of Standard VII., and doing the highest work in the school, to be receiving a salary of £100 a year, while the teachers in charge of Standards VI. and V. received salaries of £200 each?—Yes, it seems a very wrong principle.

2521. In such a case, what would you advise if £40 is to be taken off your salary in order to be added on to the salary of your assistant, in the case of a headmaster receiving a salary of over £400?—I cannot help concluding there is something wrong and anomalous about that case; it will not continue to exist long, it is only a temporary sort of an arrangement, I think.

2522. Do you think it would be advisable to make serious reductions in the salaries of the headmasters in order to adequately pay the assistant teachers who are not receiving fair remuneration for their work?—There is no doubt as to who is able to bear the reduction best; I have not held that the headmasters are too highly paid, but I think they should share in the sacrifices if they are to be made.

2522. You think if a sacrifice is to be made it should be made in proportion to the salaries paid?—Yes.

2524. You say that the members of the Teachers' Institute, you understood, took an active part in insisting upon a colonial scale, and said that they were prepared to undergo sacrifices in order to build up the salaries of those who were inadequately paid?—I am not prepared to state that they personally would be prepared to undergo sacrifices, but they advised us all to be prepared to undergo sacrifices.

2525. Do you not think that those who advocated that first, and who have not undergone sacrifices, should have the "exquisite" pleasure of doing so?—Yes, I think they should be the first.

2526. Do you think that the country teachers you represent, and some of whom I referred to this morning, if they were fairly represented on the Institute, would have arrived at the conclusions which have been arrived at and given the evidence which has been given by members of the Institute, in favour of a colonial scale?—Yesterday morning I held a different opinion, but I have accepted an assurance from Mr. Hogben since that this scale has nothing to do with the Institute, and I am bound to accept that assurance.

Mr. Hogben: That is so, neither directly nor indirectly.

2527. *The Chairman.*] Do you know whether the Educational Institute had anything whatever to do with the Bill amending the education system of New Zealand, that was introduced into Parliament in the dying hours of last session; do you know if the provisions of the Bill were discussed?—I do not recollect it.

2528. You cannot say whether the members of the Institute knew anything about this resolution, the provisions of the Bill, or wished to see such a measure passed into law?—I do not know the object of the measure—I am quite in the dark.

2529. You cannot say whether the members of the Institute advocated the passing of that Bill, or brought pressure to pass it into law?—As far as I can speak for our local Institute, I have never heard that question mooted at all.

2530. Were you a member of the executive of the Institute?—No.

2531. It is admitted that the regulations of the Board have not been adhered to, and that salaries are being paid in this district in excess of the scale: do you know the reason why?—I took it to be on account of the consideration of the Board for the hardship that certain reductions of salaries would inflict, when reductions were brought about by no fault of the teachers.

2532. Has the Board been in the habit, instead of constantly cutting down salaries through fluctuations which have occurred, of retaining teachers without reducing their salaries, until they were able to find them more suitable openings?—Yes.

2533. Do you think such would be the case under a colonial scale if teachers were under the central department?—The department seems to be a cold-blooded sort of an institution compared to the Boards.

2534. Do you think that the members of the Educational Institute would be satisfied if they had a colonial scale of salaries, and that no further tinkering of the Education Act took place?—It is a difficult question to answer.

2535. Do you know what their aspirations are?—From time to time I know.

2536. Can you say as to whether they wish to get beyond the control of Committees and

Boards, and placed themselves in the position of Civil servants under the control of the central department?—I cannot say. I should say that is their wish.

2537. You say that it is not a truly representative institution?—It does not fairly represent the smaller schools of the colony, which form the majority of the schools; and as I assured you yesterday, at that particular Council meeting there were only three teachers to represent 82½ per cent. or 85 per cent.

2538. You have been present at meetings of the branch?—Yes.

2539. Can you say whether the country teachers are well represented at those meetings?—They are not.

2540. Are they in the majority or in the minority, as compared with the city teachers?—In the minority.

2541. You are sure they are in the minority?—Yes, a decided minority.

2542. Invariably?—Yes.

2543. Is not the Educational Institute regarded as essentially a city instiution by the mass of the country teachers?—I do not know what the opinion of the back-country teachers is.

2544. Have the back-country teachers reasonable facilities for attending meetings?—No.

2545. If they attended the meetings of the local branch of the Institute would it not compel them to undergo very severe sacrifices in the matter of expense?—Yes.

2546. And out of their slender incomes are they able to undergo that expense?—No.

2547. Then, that accounts for their non-attendance at meetings?—Yes, to some extent; not altogether—not for the whole of the teachers.

2548. Do you think there is any lack of interest in the proceedings of the Institute displayed by the teachers?—There must be by a great many, who know it is absolutely impossible for them to attend.

2549. Is that because they feel they have virtually no power?—That might have something to do with it.

2550. So far as the Wellington District is concerned, you do not think that the views expressed by the local branch of the Educational Institute can be considered to truly and thoroughly represent the views of the large mass of the teachers?—I think, Sir, they would have to be modified if the large mass of teachers could attend the meetings.

2551. *Mr. Hill.*] I would like to ask you one question in reference to the staffing of the school I mentioned yesterday, and regarding which I endeavoured to obtain an answer from you: do you think that the staffing of that school would be strengthened by placing five assistant teachers in the school instead of the five pupil-teachers?—Yes; most emphatically.

A. DORSET, Secretary to the Wellington Education Board, examined.

Mr. Dorset: I do not wish to make a statement, but I have some returns here which I have been asked to place before the Commission. The first is in connection with the cookery class, which has been carried on since June, 1898. The return [Exhibit 103] shows the expenditure. I have been unable to ascertain the amount of the receipts (which have been very small) on account of Mr. Riley's absence. The statement shows that the total expenditure for 1898 amounted to £311 2s. 1d.; 1899, £731 1s. 7d.; and 1900, £725 11s. 4d. The next return [Exhibit 102] shows the annual cost of the Technical School, Wellington, for the years 1891 to 1900. I may say that the expenditure on buildings for 1900 includes the cost of the large addition at the back, which was put up at a cost of a little over £3,000. The surplus from the Exhibition was handed over to the Board as a free donation, and was subsidised by the Government. I have also prepared the following memorandum: "The cost of office and general expenses, based on this Board's present scale of grants to Committees for incidental expenses, will, I think, be covered by the £250 and the capitation grant of 11s. 3d., providing the charge for rental of school-sites and temporary schoolrooms is borne by the Building Fund." With reference to the last clause, I may say the Wellington Board has not been in a position to purchase school-sites in the city; we have taken them on lease with purchasing clauses, and are practically paying a heavy rental for three of them.

2552. *Mr. Weston.*] Did I understand you to say that £250 and 11s. 3d. capitation would be enough for incidentals?—Yes, I think so; but not if it is to carry the rent.

2553. Will it be enough for all the purposes mentioned in the Inspector-General's suggested scheme?—Yes.

2554. *Mr. Davidson.*] I find, Mr. Dorset, that the salary for the teachers at schools of between 15 and 20 is £70 under the Board's scale?—Yes, with an allowance of £10.

2555. What is that allowance made for?—It is house allowance, but is made as practically a slight increase to the salaries of the teachers.

2556. So that this scale does not represent the salaries paid to the teachers at schools of that class?—You will find a clause further over, I think, which states that £10 is added to the salaries of the teachers at the smaller schools, £20 to those of the teachers at the larger schools, and £50 to the salaries of the headmasters at the city schools, where no house is provided.

2557. If there is a residence attached to the school the salary is as stated in the scale?—Yes.

2558. Do you think that is a sufficient salary (£80) for the teachers of that class of school?—I think the minimum salary for any teacher should be £100.

2559. The salary suggested in the alternative scale for teachers of schools of from 15 to 20 is from £80 to £100—that would be an improvement on the salary paid under your scale?—I think that the minimum salary is too low altogether, and always has been.

2560. Perhaps you could tell me how many schools there are with average attendances of from 15 to 20 in your district?—Not from memory.

2561. I think there are twenty-six; so that class of school, which is a considerable proportion of the whole number in your district, would be materially benefited under the alternative scale?—Yes, decidedly.

2562. Take the next class, from 19 to 40, according to the alternative scale. I find that under your scale the salary of the teachers at schools of from 20 to 25 is £80?—Yes.

2563. That is for either male or female?—Yes.

2564. Under the alternative scale the salary for a male teacher at schools of this class would be from £120 to £130?—Yes; that would be an improvement.

2565. An increase of from £40 to £50 a year?—Yes.

2566. Do you think it would be in the interests of education to pay such salaries, and induce a better class of teacher to go into the country districts?—I always thought the salaries under the Wellington Board's scale were too low.

2567. The salary is fixed at £100, under the Wellington Board's scale, for teachers at schools of from 25 to 30?—Yes.

2568. Have you noticed the salaries suggested in the alternative scheme?—Yes; the salaries suggested in that scheme would be improvements on those paid under the Wellington Board's scale to all teachers at small schools until they get up to between £130 and £150.

2569. So that, at any rate, more than half the schools in this district would, under the alternative scale, have the salaries attached to them materially increased?—Yes, all the smaller schools, up to, I think, about 30.

2570. About 40, I think you will find?—Yes, perhaps 40.

2571. *Mr. Stewart.*] We have had it stated in evidence that the teachers at a number of schools in this district are paid salaries in excess of those laid down under the Board's regulations: would it be much trouble to you to furnish a return showing the salaries thus paid in excess of the Board's scale?—None are now paid in excess of the scale; they have all been reduced.

2572. From when?—From the first of this month. The Board instructed me to administer the regulations, except where the Board's scale is below the first proposed scale, and I have brought the salaries down to that scale. No teacher's salary has been brought below the proposed scale.

2573. Do you think that the adoption of a colonial scale—I do not specify any particular one—would be to the benefit of education?—Decidedly so; I have always thought it manifestly unfair that one teacher should get less than another who was doing equal work because he was on the other side of a river or a mountain-range. When the boundary of the Wellington District was extended to the Manawatu River the Otaki School was brought into this district, and the salary of the teacher at that school was in consequence increased by £35 a year.

2574. Do you think the adoption of a colonial scale would assist you in keeping the finances of the Board on a sound basis?—I think so; the finances will be kept on a sound basis now that the regulations are being adhered to.

2575. What is the overdraft now?—I could not say at the moment.

2576. But there is a large overdraft?—Yes.

2577. With regard to the return which you furnished showing the cost of the Technical School: has any rent or interest been charged to the Technical School for that part of this building which it uses for technical purposes?—None whatever.

2578. Then, the rent of the rooms which have been used by the Technical School classes should be added to the cost?—Yes.

2579. Then, with regard to the other building that has been erected: has any rent or interest been charged for the amount in excess of what your Board received from the Government and the surplus from the Exhibition?—No charge whatever has been made to the Technical School on account of rent, up-keep, maintenance, or anything of that sort.

2580. Then, am I justified in drawing this conclusion: that no rent, or interest, or any charge whatever having been made to the Technical School, those items have practically been a charge on the general Maintenance Fund of the Board?—Yes. This building was erected with funds taken partly out of the building vote, and partly out of the general account, at a time when there was plenty of money.

2581. Then, a very large proportion of the Maintenance Fund of your Board has been applied to the purposes of the Technical School?—Yes.

2582. Which do you think are the worst paid class of teachers—*i.e.*, those whose salaries should be considerably increased under a colonial scale?—Those with salaries below £100 are the worst paid.

2583. You have already stated that the proposed scale would benefit them?—Yes.

2584. With regard to lady teachers, on looking over the report of the Minister the impression was conveyed to my mind that the lady teachers are woefully underpaid: do you think they are adequately paid?—I do not think any of the junior teachers are adequately paid; the junior assistants are all underpaid.

2585. Take the case of the Porirua School, where the lady who is practically the assistant teacher is receiving £42 a year, after teaching for seven years: is that salary adequate?—It is altogether too low; but the circumstances that governed the position were these: £42 is the highest salary paid to a pupil-teacher; when he or she has finished his or her pupil-teachership the Board has said, "You may stay on at the same salary if you like, and apply for vacancies as assistant when they occur." But many ex-pupil-teachers prefer remaning at the same salary to going into the country. The Board's finances are seriously embarrassed by that system of keeping on the ex-pupil-teachers.

2586. Under the proposed scale the mistress at the Porirua School would be an assistant, and would receive £90 a year?—Yes.

2587. Supposing that all these proposals for a colonial scale fell through, and no colonial scale were introduced, do you think that the finances of your Board would enable it to go on paying its present scale of salaries?—Yes, according to regulations; but it will not be able to as

long as it is hampered by outside items—as long as it has to bear the strain of about £800 or £900 a year for rents, and has to carry on the Technical School.

2588. Do you think that the finances of primary education and technical education ought to be altogether distinct?—Yes; technical education ought not to be a charge on the Board's general funds.

2589. With regard to the middle-sized schools—the salaries attached to which would be reduced very considerably under the proposed scheme—they will be reduced, will they not, by the Board bringing its actual payments into accord with its scale?—Not all of them.

2590. How many of them?—Very few.

2591. What about the Tenui School?—The salary of the master has been reduced to the scale.

2592. Would that master gain or lose by the proposed colonial scale?—I would have to look at some papers on my table before I could answer that.

2593. What is the average attendance at that school?—The average attendance for the March quarter was 25.

2594. And the salary paid for that 25 according to the scale?—£100 a year.

2595. You will observe that, under the colonial scale, if the average were 19 the teacher would get £118?—Yes; there is no comparison between the proposed scale and the Board's scale with regard to small schools.

2596. The teacher at that school would gain £30 a year?—Yes.

2597. Now, considering the settlement of the Wellington District, do you or do you not think that one of the first aims of this Commission ought to be to help the smaller schools, so that the settlers can get adequate education for their children?—It should be the very first aim.

2598. Then, in that respect you approve of the suggested scale?—Yes, for the lower schools.

2599. Do you think that the maximum salary paid in your district to the headmasters of large schools is what it ought to be in order to attract the best class of teachers for the work?—No, I do not think it is. I think the man who enters the teaching profession is very poorly paid for the result of his training.

2600. What is the maximum salary which the headmaster of a city school can get in Wellington, irrespective of house allowance?—£305, exclusive of house allowance.

2601. Do you think that in drawing up a colonial scale the Commission should be content with offering the sum of £305 a year to the headmaster of the largest school in the Wellington District?—No.

2602. Do you think £350 would be enough, irrespective of house allowance?—I would not care to say what the salary should be, but £350 would not be overpayment for the services of a headmaster at one of the large city schools. When the regulations were drawn up the Board had no school of over 300.

2603. What is the maximum salary an assistant lady teacher can obtain in the Wellington District?—£100 a year.

2604. Do you think that £100 a year is sufficient remuneration for a lady assistant at any school in the Wellington District?—Not for one holding an important position.

2605. Do you think £150 would be too much?—No; but it would be a very good salary.

2606. I believe the headmistress of the Mount Cook Girls' School is the highest paid lady teacher in the Board's service?—Yes.

2607. What salary does she receive?—£264.

2608. What is the average attendance at her school?—465, according to the latest return.

2609. £264 is the salary paid to the head of a school of 465?—Yes.

2610. Do you return Mount Cook Boys', Mount Cook Girls', and Mount Cook Infants' Schools as one school, or are they separate schools?—They are entirely separate schools.

2611. Do you think that, in the event of the adoption of a colonial scale of salaries, the influence and power of the Board over its teachers would be minimised or lessened?—I do not see how the influence of the Board over its teachers could be affected at all by the adoption of a colonial scale. The question of salary does not affect the question of control over a teacher.

2612. I notice that, according to your regulations, considerable bonuses are paid for certificates?—No; no bonuses are paid for certificates. So-much of a teacher's salary is paid for his qualifications, and so-much for average attendance.

2613. But a C1 man would get more than a D1 man: is not that a bonus on his certificate?—In some districts a distinct bonus is paid; in this case it is a higher value put upon the services of the man who is better qualified for the position.

2614. Does it not come to the same thing? If a C1 man receives so much more than a D1 man holding a similar position, is not that in effect a bonus on his certificate?—I do not look at it in that light; the C1 man has better qualifications, and is better able to perform the work which he is required to do.

2615. Do you think it right in principle that a C1 man should receive more salary than a D1 man for doing the same work in the same school?—A man should be paid according to his ability to do the work.

2616. Did your Board, in framing its regulations, make any allowance whatever for the difference in the cost of living in different parts of the province?—None whatever.

2617. Do you think it is practicable to do such a thing?—I do not think the locality affects the cost of living, though house-rent is probably less in some places than others.

2618. You think there are compensating advantages where rent is high, which really put the cost-of-living question out of Court?—I think so.

2619. Has your Board any scheme of promotion?—No, we have no scheme of promotion laid down. The practice has been that, all else being equal, teachers in the service of the Board should

be promoted to vacancies, but in making an appointment the teacher who has been in the Board's service must be equal to the outside teacher in order to get preference. This Board has not restricted promotions to its own service.

2620. Supposing you had an appointment open, would you take into consideration the experience of the teacher, his or her certificate, and the reports of the Inspectors, before you submitted the name to the Committee?—All those are taken into consideration when the Board makes its selections. The Board submits to the Committee the names of all the applicants, qualified or unqualified.

2621. Does the Board in making its selection take counsel of its Inspectors as to the fitness of the different applicants for the positions?—Not on every occasion, because the Inspectors are not always in town.

2622. But does the Board consult the Inspectors when it gets an opportunity?—Not on every occasion; but it is the custom to consult the Inspectors when present at the meeting of the Board.

2623. How often is one of the Inspectors in attendance in the course of the year?—They are absent more often than they are present.

2624. Then, the bulk of the Wellington appointments may be said to be made without consultation with the Inspectors?—That is so.

2625. Do you not think that it is a great advantage for any Board to consult its Inspectors as to the fitness of candidates for positions?—That is a matter of opinion; it is a matter for every Board to decide.

2626. You have a very large number of pupil-teachers and ex-pupil-teachers in your district?—Yes.

2627. It is a very important matter that the appointment of pupil-teachers should be most carefully considered?—Yes.

2628. Have you any entrance examination for pupil-teachers as to literary fitness?—The applications from candidates for pupil-teacherships are now submitted to the Inspectors, and they recommend those who have passed an examination equal to what they (the Inspectors) would set as an entrance examination.

2629. May I take your answer to mean this: that, as far as literary qualifications are concerned, the Inspectors judge by credentials presented by the candidates at the time of making application?—Not that entirely, because the Inspectors see the candidates.

2630. Do they have an opportunity of seeing the candidates at work?—Not until they are selected.

2631. Before being selected, a candidate is personally seen by one of the Inspectors, and if the Inspector thinks that the examination passed by that candidate is sufficiently difficult, he recommends the appointment of that candidate?—That is so.

2632. Let us take such a case as that: what is done with the pupil-teacher then?—The Inspectors make a selection from the candidates, and send in their recommendations; they may recommend twenty or thirty candidates as fit for appointment—*i.e.*, any appointment the Board may have.

2633. Is there any probationary time during which their fitness for teaching is tried in the schools?—If at the end of six months the headmaster of the school reports that a candidate is not fitted for the position of pupil-teacher he or she is retired.

2634. Do the Inspectors make any special visits to schools with a view to going into the fitness of the pupil-teachers employed on probation? If you asked one of the Inspectors he would be able to tell you better than I.

2635. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Please turn to page 27 of the Minister's Report (E.–1): there are a few points in connection with the salaries paid to which attention has been called by members of the Commission and previous witnesses. Take the Nikau School: the teacher gets £80 a year for teaching 16 pupils, being at the rate of £5 a head?—Yes.

2636. The next one is Waione—the teacher there gets £90 for teaching 17, practically £5 a head; the same applies to the next, Manuhara; whereas when we take the next one, Pongaroa, we find that the teacher there gets £175 for a average attendance of 14, or £12 10s. a head. Is that teacher paid according to scale?—No; the Board decided not to reduce the salaries of teachers when the attendance fell on account of an epidemic; there was an epidemic in this district; the attendance feel suddenly, and increased again almost as suddenly.

2637. Well, then, the teachers at schools where the attendance is increasing must suffer; the Board is not getting extra capitation from the department?—The Board's funds so far have come out of the bank, that accounts for the overdraft.

2638. I suppose the bank authorities will draw the line somewhere?—Probably so.

2639. With regard to the Taueru and Hamua Schools, the teacher at the former school gets £205 for teaching 46; whereas the master at the Hamua School receives £215, or £10 extra, and teaches 5 pupils less, the average attendance being 41?—The same explanation will probably apply.

2640. I notice a similar anomaly with regard to the Fernridge School: the teacher gets £205, the attendance being 81; whereas at the Te Ore Ore School the attendance is shown as 55, and the master gets £215?—That is on account of the regulations not being adhered to; but now that the regulations are to be adhered to those anomalies will disappear.

2641. Do you find that the head-teachers under any other Board in the colony, at schools of from 50 to, say, 150, get the same salary as that allowed by the Wellington scale?—I do not think so; the Wellington scale has been exceptionally high in regard to that class of school.

2642. With reference to assistants, is it not a fact that a number of Education Boards pay their assistants—first and second assistants—more than the Wellington Board does?—That is so. There is no possibility of getting a uniform scale until a colonial scale is introduced.

2643. You advocate equal pay for equal work, no matter what part of the colony that work is performed in?—I think so.

2644. As to a colonial scale, you know that in drawing up a colonial scale this Commission are allowed to go up to £4 capitation, instead of £3 15s.: do you think it would be more feasible to draw up a colonial scale on the £4 basis than it would be to remove the anomalies by giving each of the Education Boards the extra 5s. capitation?—The extra 5s. being given to Boards would not remove the anomalies in the districts where they have no large schools: the £4 grant would not remove the anomalies throughout the colony.

2645. With regard to payment by grades or units, do you advocate the system adopted by the Wellington Board—*i.e.*, that of paying teachers by grades rather than each individual unit of average attendance?—We have always insisted that teachers shall maintain their average attendance for a certain time. If a teacher's salary is paid on the unit system, he never knows what his salary is to be—any little change may affect it.

2646. Take the case of a teacher who teaches a school of 49: his salary for teaching that school—the average attendance being between 35 and 50—is £175; if an extra pupil comes along, bringing the attendance up to 50, his salary will be increased under the Wellington scale by £40?—In all grades one must be a turning-point. There is no alteration in salary for the next 25 or 50 under our scale.

2647. The teacher would not feel it so much if an additional pupil came to his school as if one left?—A good many teachers' salaries are altered by the addition or loss of one.

2648. In cases of that kind increases by units would be more satisfactory?—Quite so.

2649. In respect to the working-average, do you find that the percentage (50) is sufficiently high to be of any benefit to country schools in this district?—There are very few schools that have less than half the roll-number present on any one occasion.

2650. Suposing it were raised to, say, two-thirds or three-fourths of the roll-number, would not that afford considerable relief?—Yes, decidedly so.

2651. Do you think a difference should be made between the work expected from a small country school, where the teacher is unaided, and that expected from a large town school?—That is a question that an Inspector would be more qualified to answer. I have nothing to do with the inside of a school; my work is financial and administrative.

2652. With regard to the question of truancy, have you had much difficulty in dealing with truants in the Wellington District?—Not such a great difficulty. The truant officer's efforts are very much hampered by the fact that parents may keep their children away for nearly half the week.

2653. Would you favour an increase from six half-day attendances in the week to eight?—I should think it would be an improvement, because it seems to me to be unfair that a parent should be able to keep his child away for half a week, and expect the teacher to keep him up to the others.

2654. You will have noticed from the suggested scale that under it the teachers at the smaller schools would get higher salaries than are being paid by the Education Boards; that would encourage teachers at country schools?—There is no doubt about that. The teachers at small schools in the country have been the worst paid.

2655. Do you find, judging from the number of applicants for positions in the towns, that there is a tendency on the part of country teachers to gravitate towards the towns?—Not to a large extent. As a rule, when a teacher is placed in charge of a country school, he sets to work to make his home there. The younger teachers strive to take advantage of the university course to better their status.

2656. What do you consider would be a fair differentiation—if there should be one—between the salaries paid to male and female teachers?—I think this Board's regulation is that a female teacher gets 75 per cent. of the salary of a male teacher; but I cannot see why there should be any difference at all in the case of the teachers at the small country schools.

2657. *Mr. Hill.*] I understand that it has been the effort of your Board to adapt the salaries to the conditions of districts?—Yes, so far as the back-country districts are concerned.

2658. That is, they give salaries to teachers in small schools on account of the special conditions existing there. Is that why the salaries vary so much?—The variation in the salaries has been caused by the Board's scale not being adhered to. The Board decided not to reduce salaries on account of the attendance having fallen.

2659. In reality your district has had for some time past a number of scales in operation at the same time?—Yes; practically so.

2660. And teachers at small schools have received larger salaries than teachers at schools with a higher average attendance?—Yes, that is so, because their salaries have not been reduced.

2661. Do you think that if a generalised scheme were adopted, and it was provided that the teachers should hold all the rights which they at present possess in the matter of salaries for a number of years, the very same conditions would exist under such a scheme as exist in your district?—Not under a new scheme.

2662. If the scheme provided that all the conditions which exist at present in your district and other districts were to be continued for a period, would not the same results ensue that now prevail here?—To a certain extent only, because the Boards would be enabled in many cases to make the necessary transfers in order to bring teachers up to scale.

2663. Do you not think that would tend to great dissatisfaction among the teachers?—It is just a question of postponing the evil day.

2664. Do you not think it would tend to cause more dissatisfaction than at present?—I am not prepared to say that.

2665. If it brought up the lower salaries to the level of the higher ones, and the high ones

were not brought down at all, do you think that would lead to great dissatisfaction?—No; I think those whose salaries were increased would be quite prepared to accept the increase so long as their brothers' salaries were not reduced.

2666. You recognise that the scale which has been proposed by the Inspector-General would benefit your schools in a great measure?—Yes, in a great measure.

2667. Would it benefit the majority of the teachers in your district?—I think so.

2668. Supposing that an allowance of £4 a head were paid to your Board, on the distinct understanding that the scale should be so arranged that the increase of 5s. would be spent in increasing the teachers' salaries, could you, from your experience, supply a scale equal to the proposed one?—It is purely a matter of opinion. I think that the information at the disposal of the Inspector-General would be much beyond the information that I would have in the preparation of a colonial scale.

2669. I mean for your own district. Could you draw up a scale yourself, and pay the salaries suggested in the proposed scale?—A proposal was made by the Board to the department, but it did not meet the higher salaries as the proposed scale does.

2670. Did it meet the lower salaries?—The Board thought it met them in an equitable manner.

2671. Was the staffing as generous?—No; not in regard to the assistants.

2672. Did you recognise that your Board could not draw up a scale as generous as the scale suggested by the Inspector-General?—Not with the limited sum at its disposal.

2673. Then, this proposed scale would benefit your district materially?—Yes.

2674. You have heard of the proposal to remove the Inspectors from the control of the Education Boards, and place them under the control of the central department: has your Board ever considered that question?—The very first Wellington Board made that recommendation to the Education Department.

2675. Then the Board wishes to get rid of the control of the inspectorate?—I do not think that is the point: the idea of the Board was that there should be an interchange of districts among the Inspectors.

2676. Have you ever heard any proposal made that School Committees instead of Education Boards should have the appointment of teachers at their own schools, seeing that they know the needs of the schools better?—I never heard of any authoritative proposal of the kind.

2677. Of course, you are aware that this proposal to formulate a colonial scale, if carried out, will limit in some measure the functions of the Boards, inasmuch as it will take away the power of distributing £3 8s. 9d. of the £4 capitation?—Quite so.

2678. Do you understand why the proposal is made to limit the functions of Education Boards in that way?—My impression is that it is to insure a certain amount of money being distributed among the teachers.

2679. It is proposed to leave 11s. 3d. a head to the Education Boards to distribute, is it not?—Yes.

2680. If we allow this 11s. 3d. to be distributed by the various Education Boards, will not the very same anomalies exist with regard to the school fund as exist with regard to teachers' salaries?—Yes, anomalies exist in the different districts.

2681. School Committees with the same average attendance at their schools do not get the same amounts in the various districts?—No.

2682. Why should not the same treatment be meted out to School Committees as is proposed to be meted out to the teachers in the matter of the allocation of the remaining 11s. 3d.? Why not take away the power from the Education Boards, and ask the central department to formulate a scale so that all the Committees, as well as all the teachers, shall be treated in the same manner? Do you think that would be an unfair demand?—Yes. If that demand were granted the power of the Boards would be unduly curtailed. If you have Education Boards you must give them something to do.

2683. Do you recognise that it would be a good thing for the central department to draw up a scale on the £3 8s. 9d. basis for the teachers?—That would be a matter of equalisation of teachers' salaries all over the colony.

2684. Why not give School Committees, where the average attendance is the same, the same amount for maintenance?—Because the circumstances of districts may affect Committees to a considerable extent and not affect the teachers.

2685. Take two schools in the country, with an average attendance of 25 at each: why should one get £10 and the other £20?—One may have firewood practically stacked against the door and the other may have to cart it from a distance. Then again, the sanitary arrangements are more costly in some districts than others. This Board has invariably helped School Committees when they have got into difficulties. Where we have found the funds provided by the scale were not sufficient to enable Committees to administer their functions properly we have had to do certain works for them.

2686. If the power of the Boards over the inspectorate is taken away, and the power of making scales for the payment of teachers' salaries is taken from them, and if this other suggestion as to the appointment of teachers by School Committees is carried out, what remains for the Boards to do?—Very little. Nearly all their powers would be taken away from them.

2687. What would be the good of them then?—That is a question that I am not prepared to answer; it is a matter for members of the Board to discuss.

2688. I understand that your Board has paid £9,586 for the maintenance of the Technical School during the past ten years, and that during the same period fees have been paid by the students to the amount of £8,676, and the Government subsidies received during the same period amounted to £2,395?—If those figures are in accordance with the statement I read, they are correct.

2689. Have you estimated the amount that has been paid for the maintenance of the Technical School out of the school funds?—No.

2690. Forty-seven per cent. of the cost of the Technical School has been paid out of the school funds, 42 per cent. of the cost has been met by students' fees, and the subsidies from the Government have amounted to 11½ per cent.: do you think that 47 per cent. of the cost of the school should be defrayed by funds which are supposed to provide teachers' salaries?—I do not think that 1 per cent. of the cost of the Technical School should be paid out of the teachers' salaries fund.

2691. Do you know that during the past ten years, according to my calculation, 2¾ per cent. of the total income of your Board has been expended in the maintenance of this school; therefore it is a tax upon the teachers to that amount?—Yes.

2692. The salaries of the teachers in your district could have been raised to that extent had that school been maintained—as I say it should have been—by the Government?—The money would have been available for other purposes. The Board had the power to devote the whole of it to teachers' salaries if it had been available.

2693. Has that school been working specially for Wellington, or for the whole of New Zealand?—I could not tell you.

2694. Has it been working for the Education District of Wellington?—As far as practicable.

2695. It has been doing work not only for the City of Wellington, but for the whole of the education district?—Yes.

2696. Has it fostered art and science in this colony?—I assume that it has; others would be better able to answer that question.

2697. You think that a school of that sort should not be maintained out of the funds which are given for primary education?—The assumption is that the cost of the fostering of art and science is met by the fees paid for instruction in drawing and painting.

2698. But the students' fees amount to only 42 per cent. of the amount received: has the school done no other service besides train those who attend the classes: has it not fostered art education in this district?—Decidedly.

2699. Has it been receiving no more than £240 a year from the Government, on an average, for the ten years?—For the first two or three years the Government subsidies were £100 a year only. It is only in the last year or two that technical education has been considered at all in the matter of subsidies.

2700. Have you considered whether the Manual and Technical Instruction Act will benefit the school at all?—Mr. Riley says it will to the extent of about £1,000 a year.

2701. Do you think the present plan of certification of teachers is a good one?—I think five divisions too many; but that is a matter of opinion, and I am not competent to give an opinion.

2702. Are you of opinion that a man should be paid because he possesses a diploma, or because he shows skill in the profession which he follows?—I think that skill should be the first element, and the diploma the second; but the two should be taken into consideration.

2703. When you go to consult a lawyer do you think of the diploma he holds, or the skill he possesses?—It is a question of the man's ability—his skill.

2704. When you go to a man of that kind do you think of what kind of examination he has passed, or do you go to him in order that you might get the best possible result from him?—In order that the best possible results may be obtained.

2705. Now, do you think that in the case of a teacher you should pay him for what he does in the school, or for something he obtained in order to qualify himself to teach?—The expert man could not be a practical man unless he had studied for these examinations. You should pay him for the examinations he has undergone. I do not think that a man with an E certificate is equal to a man with an A, B, C, or D certificate.

2706. Would you give the same pay to two men occupying similar positions, and doing equal work, if one held a higher diploma than the other?—I do not see why they should not get the same salary if they do equal work and occupy similar positions.

2707. Then take the case of a woman. Supposing she does the same work as a man, what difference, if any, should there be between the salaries?—You have to study outside influences.

2708. You would differentiate the salaries?—Yes. With regard to the Technical School, I may explain that it was established by the Board upon the written assurance of the then Premier of the colony that the money expended on it would be refunded by Parliament. The question of Mr. Riley's appointment was submitted to the Government, it being pointed out to them that if he were engaged he would want to start technical education, and the then Premier gave his assurance that the money spent by the Board on technical education would be refunded.

J. R. Blair, Chairman of the Wellington Education Board, examined.

Mr. Blair: I have not prepared a statement, but I should like to make one or two remarks. I have noticed many of the statements that have been made in evidence before this Commission with regard to a colonial scale of salaries. My opinion is that a colonial scale would create a larger number of anomalies than the present scales. If you introduce a colonial scale, how are you going to take cognisance of the difference in the cost of living at different places? There is a difference, I imagine, of at least 25 per cent. between the cost of living at Wellington and, say, Woodville; so that by a colonial scale you would create a series of anomalies extending over the whole of New Zealand.

2709. *The Chairman.*] Have you any suggestion to make as to how salaries could be equalised or made more uniform than they are without the introduction of a colonial scale?—I think that a certain sum should be given to the Boards, and they should be allowed to adjust the salaries to the best advantage; the Boards know the inequalities of their districts. I think that that would be

quite satisfactory, without the introduction of a colonial scale. I have said that a colonial scale, instead of introducing uniformity of pay, would do the very opposite. I have no objection at all, from a theoretical point of view, to the department paying the teachers. I do not know whether it comes within the scope of the Commission to deal with the question of Boards. I have felt all along that Boards are in an anomalous position: they are irresponsible bodies dealing with moneys that are given to them, without any responsibility, practically, as to the disbursement of those sums. If the department or the Minister of Education, or those who are responsible for the present state of affairs, desire to put Boards upon a proper footing they should remodel them altogether. Let the public elect them, and then the Boards would have public opinion behind them, and be able to deal with such questions as salaries and staffing with the public to account to. At the present time they are practically irresponsible, being elected by bodies that seem to think they, rather than the general public, ought to control the Boards. It will be recollected that it was only owing to the fact of the London School Board being elected by the people of London that the imposition of a religious test on the teachers of London was prevented.

2710. You think it would be an improvement if the Boards were elected by the people, instead of by the Committees, as at present?—I certainly think so. I have always felt that we have not had public opinion behind us in any step that we have taken with reference to educational matters—that we were responsible to the Committees, and not to the public. It seems anomalous that in these times a fancy franchise should exist with regard to the election of Education Boards. A good deal has been said about the difficulty of obtaining male pupil-teachers. We have found that we have always had a certain number of applications from males for pupil-teacherships, but the applicants have not been of the same quality as the girls who have applied; although we have, I think, stretched a point in order to employ as many males as possible. The female pupil-teachers have undoubtedly come—and especially of late—better equipped than the boys. We can now in this district obtain the services of female pupil-teachers with the equipment of a D certificate. Those that pass well in the matriculation examination are so equipped—that is, so far as the literary portion of their certificate is concerned; and when they have gone through the process inaugurated by Mr. Lee, our senior Inspector—*i.e.*, sending them into the infants' schools, where they go through the kindergarten system—I am of opinion that they are then excellent material for carrying on the work of junior classes at our standard schools.

2711. *Mr. Davidson.*] You are aware that each of the thirteen Education Boards in the colony has a scale of salary and staffing drawn up by either the officials of the Boards or the members?—Yes.

2712. And that these scales, with regard to both staffing and salaries, differ very much?—Yes.

2713. I suppose you are also aware that very great inequalities exist in the salaries paid to men doing the same work and holding the same certificate?—Yes, I am aware that there are disparities.

2714. Do you think it is in the interests of education that such very great inequalities should exist?—No, I do not think it is.

2715. If the Education Boards had a uniform scale of staff for the different grades of school in the colony, and paid their teachers on a uniform scale of salary, do you not think a good deal of the discontent and dissatisfaction that exist at the present time would be removed?—I do not know. It seems to me that the teachers want to be put in glass cases: that is an impression which has been created in my mind. Take Wellington: so far as the city teachers are concerned, they are in a very good position. They have a special Act, by which all their concerns are governed, they work five hours a day and five days a week, have numerous holidays, and I do not know what more they want.

2716. Do you not think that there is a good deal of cause for dissatisfaction on the part of a man who may be teaching within a few miles of the border of a certain district, and be receiving from £30 to £50 a year less than a man over the border who does the same work and holds the same certificate?—Yes, under the circumstances. I do not mean to say that these inequalities should not be redressed; but I hold they can only be redressed by an administrative body in the district.

2717. What, in your opinion, is the cause of the great inequalities that exist in the salaries paid in the different districts?—Want of money on the part of the Boards. If you take the case of Otago you will find that they have a larger number of large schools than any other district, and the profits arising from these large schools enable them to have a more liberal scale of salaries than a small Board with a large number of small schools.

2718. How would you remedy the evil?—You would have to give the district with the large number of small schools a larger grant.

2719. Then, you would not give an equal capitation grant to the different Boards?—If you did, Otago would be placed in a still better position.

2720. So long as an equal capitation grant to the Education Boards exists you cannot possibly have a uniform scale of salaries?—No.

2721. Do you think it would be a disadvantage to the Boards if they were asked to pay to their teachers the money received from the department on a scale drawn up by this Commission, instead of on the many different scales that now exist?—I think it would be more likely to be satisfactory if the Commission drew up a scale affecting each individual Board and its district rather than a general scale.

2722. If the Commission drew up a uniform scale, and the money received by the Boards from the department were paid just as it is now, but instead of being paid out on a scale drawn up by each Board it were paid out on a scale drawn up by this Commission, would that be more satisfactory?—Yes. It seems to me that, with your extended knowledge, you would be more likely to meet the case than the department.

2723. You have in the Wellington District a scale of salaries to which you have not been able to adhere strictly in the past?—That departure has occurred quite recently—within the last two years.

2724. We have been told that the teachers' salaries have been costing the Wellington Board £1,200 a year beyond the scale amount?—That may be so; perhaps it may be a little more.

2725. I understand that your Board has decided to adhere to its own scale, but in no instance to reduce a teacher's salary to a lower amount than that which he would receive under the suggested scale?—Yes; that is, contingent upon the grant from the Government being continued.

The Chairman: Certain salaries have been increased since this Government grant was placed at the disposal of the Board, and it has been able to do more justice to the teachers.

2726. *Mr. Davidson.*] In future you mean to pay according to a modified scale—you intend to adhere strictly to your scale of salaries?—Yes; the Board has resolved to do that, contingent on the grant from the Government being continued.

2727. By departing from its scale any Board in the colony might become financially embarrassed?—In Wellington up till two years ago we had an annual increase in the attendance, which enabled us to carry on under our scale; for some reason or other, all of a sudden the increase dropped and disappeared, but is now reappearing in a limited degree. In one instance the attendance dropped to such an extent that a man, with a family, who was receiving £150 would, if we had adhered to the scale, have been reduced to £90. I think that in that instance the fall in attendance was due to the removal of some railway-men—a circumstance over which the teacher had no control whatever—and the Board, in considering the position, could not see that it was justified in reducing that man to £90.

2728. But the Wellington Board has determined to adhere it to its scale in the future?—Yes.

2729. So that some of the teachers who were receiving less than the scale will be brought up to it, and those who were receiving more will be brought down to it?—That is so.

2730. It has really been out of sympathy for these special cases that the Board has treated them in a special manner?—Yes.

2731. The Wellington Board pays the teachers at schools of from 15 to 20 in average attendance a fixed salary of £70?—Yes.

2732. Do you think that is sufficient?—No, I do not think it is at all adequate. I have much sympathy with these teachers.

2733. Under the proposed scale these teachers would receive from £80 to £100, instead of the fixed salary of £70: that would be a distinct improvement?—Yes.

2734. There is another class of teacher to whom the sympathy of the Board would have been extended had they the funds, I have not the slightest doubt: I refer to those at schools of from 20 to 25—the next grade?—Yes.

2735. I understand from your answer to my previous question that you would consider £80 an altogether inadequate salary for those teachers?—Yes, that is so.

2736. That class of teacher, under the suggested scale, would receive from £120 to £140 a year?—Yes.

2737. That is the class of teacher whose position, in your opinion, should be improved?—Yes.

2738. The next grade of teacher—those at schools of from 25 to 30—would also be greatly benefited by the suggested scale; so that the majority of the schools in the Wellington District would carry a very much better salary under the proposed scale than they do at present?—Yes. My Board does not take any exception to the increases proposed by the department to teachers at country schools.

2739. If this Commission formulated a scale which would be uniform throughout the colony, and which would vastly improve the condition of the teachers at a great majority of the schools in the colony—*i.e.*, the country schools—would you approve of that?—Yes, certainly.

2740. Do you think that the secretaries of the Education Boards were correct in their statements to this Commission that, in their opinion, the effect of the Boards paying out the salaries to their teachers on a uniform scale, instead of on a scale drawn up by their officials, would in no way weaken the control of the Boards over their teachers?—I do not see any reason for thinking that it would affect the control in any way. We now get a sum of money in one amount, instead of a sum fixed by a scale. It would come to the same thing.

2741. The only difference would be that a Board would be paying the money to its teachers on a scale drawn up by this Commission instead of on its own scale?—Exactly.

2742. In your opinion, should the appointment of teachers be in the hands of the School Committees, or in the hands of the Education Boards?—I am distinctly of the opinion that the Education Boards should make the appointments. I know of a case here in which complaint was made that the Board had made a bad selection, and I was able to prove that the applications sent to the Committee had absolutely never been looked at. I may explain that this Board's practice is somewhat different from that of other Boards; we forward all the applications to the local Committee, intimating that the Board has selected a certain candidate as, in their opinion, being the best fitted for the position. On the occasion to which I refer a deputation from the Committee waited on the Board, and complained that the secretary of the Board had not forwarded them a letter. The secretary had informed me that he had sent them a letter, and that it had been placed in the bundle containing the applications. I asked for the bundle to be produced, opened it, and the letter was on the top of the applications. I do not mean to infer that all Committees do that; I know that some of them take a very keen interest in the quality of their teachers. But the case I have mentioned is an instance—and not a solitary one—of the small interest that some Committees take, being satisfied with the personal application of a particular candidate.

2743. Then, in your opinion, an Education Board is the authority most capable of forming a judgment, after consulting with its Inspectors, as to the qualifications of candidates for the teaching profession?—I have no doubt at all that, if the Education Boards avail themselves of the knowledge and guidance of their responsible officers, they are the proper authorities to make appointments, and the only authorities that can make proper appointments.

2744. I find, according to the last report of the Minister of Education, that the number of pupil-teachers in your district is 175, as compared with 245 adult teachers?—Yes.

2745. Do you think the number of pupil-teachers in this district is too great?—Of course, it is all a question of finance. There is no question at all that the schools would be very much benefited if staffed entirely with certificated teachers, instead of pupil-teachers, provided the country could afford it. There is no difficulty in formulating ideal theories.

2746. Are you aware that in Glasgow, London, Manchester, Birmingham, and other places the number of pupil-teachers has been reduced very greatly indeed?—Yes.

2747. And the salaries paid to the teachers at these places are considerably larger than they were a few years ago?—Yes.

2748. I notice that at a school of from 41 to 75 in your district the staff is composed of a head-teacher and a pupil-teacher: do you not think it would be a decided advantage, educationally, if at such schools the staff consisted of a head-teacher and an assistant?—At the instigation of Mr. Lee, the head Inspector, the Board recently passed a resolution providing that schools of that size should be so staffed in future.

2749. We heard—I think it was yesterday—that in such a case, where an ex-pupil-teacher was employed, under the change of scale that ex-pupil-teacher would become an assistant, and be called such?—Yes.

2750. What salary would be attached to the position?—As far as I recollect, £80 a year.

2751. That change will come into operation?—It is coming into operation now as vacancies occur.

2752. You are really falling in, I understand, with the suggestions submitted to this Commission?—Yes.

2753. *Mr. Stewart.*] You said in your evidence just now that you objected to a colonial scale because you thought it would create more anomalies than exist at present?—Yes.

2754. In the course of your examination by Mr. Davidson you admitted that there were a great number of anomalies existing at present?—Yes.

2755. You indicated one anomaly that might come out by the introduction of a colonial scale—namely, the difference in the cost of living at different places?—Yes.

2756. Would you kindly name any other anomaly that a colonial scale would be likely to create?—Under a colonial scale you would give to a rich district—rich from the point of view of the Board's finances—like Otago, the same capitation grant that you would give to a poor district, such as the West Coast. In Otago there are a large number of schools that make big profits, whereas in the West Coast District there are a large number of schools that make no profit.

2757. Supposing there was a school of, say, 200 in Otago, and a school of 200 on the West Coast, would there be any difference in the salaries paid at those schools?—There ought not to be.

2758. Then, how could Otago make a profit that Westland would not?—I understand what you mean now. Hitherto we have received a grant of £3 15s. a head, out of which we have had to pay everything. If you are going to separate the money for the teachers' salaries from the other moneys, then it will not act in the same way.

2759. The proposal is that the finance with regard to the teachers' salaries should be separated from the finance regarding the other items of expenditure?—Then a colonial scale would not act in the way I have indicated.

2760. Do you not think that from an actuarial and theoretical point of view it is a perfectly sound principle to separate the finance of any business concern, so that the different departments are kept clear and distinct?—There is no objection to that that I can see.

2761. Do you think it would be a sound principle to work upon as far as Education Board finance is concerned?—I certainly think teachers' salaries should be assured.

2762. Supposing that such proposals as I have indicated were carried into effect—namely, that the salary question should be altogether separate from other questions of finance, and a school of 200 in Westland should bring to the Westland Board the same amount of capitation as a school of 200 in Wellington—would you approve of that?—I have no objection to that; but there still would be the anomaly that the teachers at the Westland school would have to pay very much more for house-rent and other supplies than the teachers at the Wellington school.

2763. Would there be any other anomaly? We have got rid of one, which proved to be a misconception: what other anomalies would there be?—A teacher at £80 a year at one of our back-block schools, where there are no roads, where supplies are extremely difficult to obtain, and where accommodation of any kind is difficult to get, will not be paid on the same basis as a teacher in another district who is getting the same salary. That is an anomaly.

2764. I think you instanced Woodville, and compared the cost of living there with the cost of living at Wellington?—Yes.

2765. Would there be a great difference?—Yes.

2766. Which would be the cheaper?—Woodville, of course.

2767. Would not there be the extra cost of commodities being taken from the Port of Napier to Woodville?—No; the Woodville people get their supplies by rail from Wellington.

2768. You think Woodville would be the cheaper place to live at?—I mentioned Woodville because I happened to stay there for a fortnight recently, and I was struck by the low rents and the cheapness of commodities. Of course, the same state of things would not prevail in some of our back blocks.

2769. Then, there are great differences in the cost of living at places within the Wellington District?—Yes.

2770. May I ask what arrangements your Board make to meet those differences in the cost of living in different parts of the Wellington District?—Quite recently the minimum salaries of the teachers at the small schools were raised. My Board did not consider them adequate then, but they did the best they could with the funds at their disposal.

2771. Was that change made simply to make the remuneration adequate, or was it made on account of the differences in the prices of commodities at different places?—It was made on the representation of Mr. Hogg as to the cost of living, and the amount of sacrifice a teacher has to make when he goes to one of the back-block schools.

2772. I think you said that you thought the Board was in a very anomalous position, being irresponsible as a public body?—Yes.

2773. Do you not think that under those circumstances it would be better for the Parliament of the colony to adopt any fair scale that it thought fit, because Parliament would be directly responsible to the people for what they did? If a colonial scale were drawn up by this Commission, submitted to Parliament, and passed, would not your objection be removed: would not that be actual direct responsibility to the people of the colony?—Not on the part of the Board.

2774. But on the part of the House?—Yes; but the House does not administer the education of the district. I might say that, so far as I understand the question, if this Commission draws up a scale, after having fully considered the matter, which would improve the condition of our country teachers, I should support it to the uttermost.

2775. You are probably aware that the proposed scale would decidedly improve the condition of the country teachers?—I do not know what the proposals are.

2776. It has been admitted by the secretary to your Board that the proposed scale would greatly improve the teachers at a large number of your schools?—Then I am quite in favour of it, especially if it would improve the condition of the country teachers.

2777. With regard to the difficulty of obtaining male pupil-teachers, I gathered from what you said that your Board does not get the best class of male candidates—that you only get, so to speak, the second quality: you said they were not equal to the females?—Yes.

2778. Have you any idea as to how that arises?—I cannot say how it comes about. I think it arises principally from the unwillingness of boys to go into the drudgery of the after-study. Boys nowadays do not care about being confined at night studying for examinations. I have had a good deal of intercourse with boys, who have come to me to inquire about what would be expected of them, and I have always found that they disliked that portion of the work.

2779. You think it necessary, in the interests of the country, that we should keep up the supply of male teachers, I presume?—I do not think that, even if you increased the remuneration, it would have any great influence on the supply of male pupil-teachers.

2780. You misunderstood my question: You would not like to see the schools of the colony conducted solely by lady teachers?—No. I do not like to say so, because I have been brought into close contact with a large number of our teachers—a class whom I very highly respect—but I think that another influence has been, and is, retarding the coming-forward of boys: they have begun to look upon the teaching profession as rather an effeminate one, and it has not many attractions from that point of view. I think that a system of education where female teaching predominates is not likely to produce the best results.

2781. You think that there are two spheres of influence in the schools, and they should be filled by the respective sexes?—Yes; and that the female sphere should not predominate.

2782. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you not think that the discrepancies in the salaries paid to teachers in the different education districts is a deterrent to the interests of education generally; and would it not be better if a colonial scale were introduced, by which a teacher with a certain certificate and experience would receive as much salary in one district as in another? Do you not think that would help the cause of education, and tend to make ours a more national system?—I do not know exactly whether that would be so. I think that teachers should be adequately paid wherever they are; but, taking a broader basis, is there any reason for thinking that if teachers were paid the same all the world over the efficiency of education would be increased? You have to pay according to your means, no matter where you are. It is entirely a question of finance. There is no member on my Board who desires to see teachers' salaries reduced. So far as I know, the members would be very glad to increase salaries all round very materially. I have seen the time in New Zealand when it was very difficult to get salaries, and I think the probability is that we will sooner or later have another similar time to face.

2783. In some districts teachers cannot be obtained?—I am glad to be able to say for the Wellington District that we have no such difficulty. Recently for a first-assistantship we had forty-three applications.

2784. Have you many small schools in this district?—Yes, a large number of small schools, proportionately.

2785. Do you think any of these could be amalgamated?—The difficulty that we have had to encounter with reference to those schools is that we have had to place a school, say, in a clearing. We have bush country between that clearing or settlement and the next settlement, but when the bush has been cleared we will be able to amalgamate a number of those schools. That is the reason why we have in this district relatively such a large number of small schools. In one district we have three or four schools where I think two would suffice if roads were made between the places.

2786. Have you ever tried the half-time system?—No, not in this district.

2787. With regard to sending names of applicants to Committees, do you not think it would be better if you sent only a few names to the Committee? Would it not be better to get the

Inspectors to recommend, say, five applicants, and let the Committee choose from among those five?—I do not think so. We have had no experience of such a system here; and, looking at the experience of Otago—we have only got the reports to go by—it seems that that system frequently leads to the choice of the least fitting of the five; and I think I am right in saying that it has given rise to a great deal of squabbling between the Board and the Committees.

2788. That is the system that obtains in Auckland, and it has been fairly successful. The Inspectors generally choose five or six of the best applicants, and their names are sent to the Committee, who are precluded from choosing any one outside of the five or six?—I have had a great deal of experience in going over applications under our system here—probably twenty years' experience—and I do not think that on any occasion when I have had a list of applicants for a vacancy in this district I could not point out the best man of the number. Almost invariably there is one head and shoulders above the other applicants; occasionally, however, there are two or three who might be classed as No. 1.

2789. Under your system does the Committee generally choose the best man?—They do not choose at all; the Act does not permit them to choose. Our system is that the Board selects the teacher whom it thinks the best qualified for the vacancy. It sends that name forward to the Committee, with an intimation that the Board has selected that teacher as the best among the applicants; but it also sends the other applications, so that the Committee may judge for itself as to the accuracy or otherwise of the Board's selection. We have been advised that the Board's making the selection is in accordance with the provisions of the Act, so that the other Boards are practically not administering the Act when they send forward five names. The Committee then makes the appointment.

2790. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] In sending the applications on to the Committee, what instructions do the Board issue? Do they ask the Committee to find fault with the selected candidate and recommend another, giving reasons for so doing; or do they ask the Committee to send in their own recommendation irrespective of the choice of the Board?—The Board sends forward the applications to the Committee, with the name of the applicant selected by the Board; and if the Committee have any objection to make to the Board's selection they have an opportunity. If they make relevant objections the Board attends to them.

2791. Does it not often happen that the candidate selected is a stranger to the Committee, so that they cannot take exception to him?—Probably all the applicants are strangers to the Committee.

2792. Have the Board always adopted the plan of going through the applications themselves and selecting one?—Yes, so far as my experience goes. I think I am right in saying that we have had less trouble with Committees in this district than has been the case in any other district in New Zealand.

2793. Supposing that the Committee does forward reasons against the appointment of the nominee of the Board, does the Board consider the recommendation of the Committee, or does it generally and invariably appoint the applicant that has been first selected?—The Board has always been very anxious to work in accord with the Committees, and when they have had anything like a case at all the Board has given way. The Board has never taken up the attitude that it was absolutely immaculate. Whenever a reasonable representation has been made the Board has given way.

2794. With regard to the adoption of a colonial scale, you consider that the cost of living is a difficulty that will have to be surmounted: is any difficulty experienced in this respect in connection with the servants of the Postal Department or the Railway Department, under whose classification schemes the salaries are the same in any part of the colony?—I think that the railway service is altogether different from the educational service. For one thing, the railways, I take it, carry the supplies for the men employed in their service. Teachers at schools away in the back blocks, which you would have extreme difficulty in reaching, are altogether in a different position from the men in the railway service.

2795. Am I to understand from what you say that the Wellington Board has a separate scale for schools in the back blocks, or does each teacher petition the Board for an increase of salary and get what he can?—It is a special scale in this respect: that at one time not very long ago the salaries paid to teachers at those small schools were very much lower; they have been raised since, and would have been raised higher if the Board had the means.

2796. Have you compared the suggested scale with the Wellington Board's scale?—Yes.

2797. Have you seen the suggested scale No. 2?—With reference to the alternative scale, I may say that the secretary and I went over it with a view to as far as possible reconcile some of the anomalies that exist. We found that, on the whole, the proposals were acceptable. It was in regard to comparatively only a few cases that we disagreed with it.

2798. Have you compared the Wellington Board's scale with the other Boards' scales?—No; the secretary and I went into the Otago scale and the Canterbury scale, and found that, on the whole, especially in connection with the middle class of school, the Wellington scale was rather better than either.

2799. But take the larger class of school: we find that the salaries paid in Otago, North Canterbury, and Hawke's Bay are considerably higher than those paid in Wellington; and the same applies to teachers with lower salaries?—We are more just; we do not give high salaries to those who have plenty.

2800. If you had increased the salaries of the teachers at the smallest schools it would have been better than increasing the salaries of those at the middle class of schools. With regard to the establishment of small schools, do you think that the Legislature should lay down a rule that a school should not be established unless a minimum number of children — whatever it might be—were forthcoming, in order to save the Boards from pressure being brought to bear

on them to establish small schools?—I think that would be very unwise. There are places in the country where the children would never get schools at all at that rate. I think it is a most important matter that the country settlers should have every educational facility that we can afford them.

2801. Do you realise that if the Otago and Southland Boards were as liberal in the establishment of small schools as other Boards in the colony they would not be able to pay the salaries they are paying now?—This is a bush district, whereas Otago is a district that has practically no bush. We have not clear country, and have had to establish schools as settlements were made in the bush. As far as I am concerned, I entirely disapprove of the multiplication of small schools; it is a great educational disadvantage, but we have circumstances which we cannot get over. If small schools are not established numbers of children will get no education at all.

2802. My point is this: There are a small number of schools about Milford Sound, but if the Southland Board had been as liberal in the establishment of small schools there as, say, the Marlborough Board they would not be able to pay the salaries which they are paying?—Even there the circumstances are entirely different. The country about Milford Sound is capable of producing little or nothing, whereas here we have a country that is capable of producing the best, and it is only a question of time when there will be plenty of population here.

2803. With regard to bonuses, do you advocate the system of bonuses being granted to teachers on the certificates they hold?—I am entirely and absolutely opposed to bonuses in any shape or form. I have seen a large commercial concern wrecked by bonuses. You see how the system operates: In a year of the hardest strain no bonuses are given; when everything is prosperous you give bonuses, because you have made profits; then bad times come again, and a man has to worry and do double the amount of work, and gets no bonus.

2804. You said that your Board have endeavoured—very laudably, I may say—to keep up the salaries where the attendance has gone down in country districts?—Yes.

2805. Is it not a fact that by so doing your Board must have been keeping so much back from the salaries of other teachers where the attendance was increasing? For example, suppose there was a sum of £1,200 a year paid beyond the amount allowed by the scale: if that £1,200 were distributed among the teachers at the schools where the average was increasing the salaries would be raised considerably? It was really robbing Peter to pay Paul?—There is no doubt we did wrong under the circumstances. We did not adhere to our scale in the first instance, and reduce salaries when the average attendance fell; and we failed to raise salaries to our scale where the attendance had increased; but the Board had to take cognisance of this fact: that by reducing the salaries where the attendance had fallen we would still further accentuate the difficulty of the position—*i.e.*, by further reducing the salaries of those whose salaries were already inadequate. It was merely a matter of expediency—of doing the best under the circumstances.

2806. Do you notice that under the alternative scale the teachers at the small country schools would receive more than is paid them by, I think, any Board in the colony?—I am entirely and absolutely in accord with that. I support that without any hesitation whatever.

2807. Respecting the anomalies that exist at present in the way of salaries, supposing the extra 5s. capitation were granted indiscriminately to all the Boards, would it tend in any way to lessen the anomalies? Supposing that the Otago and Marlborough Boards—taking the strongest and the weakest—received the extra 5s. a head capitation, would that tend in any way to minimise the disparities that exist?—I do not know about the Otago or the Marlborough Boards. I can only say that the scale that was prepared and submitted to my Board was, on the whole, so far as I know the views of teachers in this district, satisfactory to them.

2808. *Mr. Weston.*] Which scale are you referring to?—The scale that was prepared by the secretary to the Board and myself. It made a few alterations upon the department's scale—not a great many—and, as far as I know the views of teachers, that scale seemed to give more satisfaction than the present scale.

2809. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] The point is this: The only possibility of removing the anomalies that exist is by the adoption of a colonial scale, because if we pay to the stronger Boards the extra 5s. capitation it means that the salaries that are already high will be increased, whereas the extra 5s. given to a weak Board would be a mere bagatelle?—If the capitation grant were to be on the basis of £4 or £5 a head, with so-much for salaries, then the Otago Board would still be in a better position than any other Board. The salaries may be the same, but the Board would have a much larger sum out of the remaining portion for anything else that it chose to do. It would be in the position of being able to still further increase salaries if it so pleased.

2810. I do not see that, unless the Inspectors were placed under the central department, because if the grant were paid by Parliament on the scale of salaries passed by the Legislature the £4 capitation would entirely disappear. The salaries would be placed on the estimates and passed in a lump sum—the same as the salaries of the Railway and Post Office officials are passed—irrespective of whether the amount came to a little more than £4 a head or less?—The remaining portion of the grant would be greater in the case of Otago than that paid to a Board with a large number of small schools.

2811. You mean the 11s. 3d.?—Yes.

2812. With respect to staffing, do you not consider that the same staff that can efficiently teach a school—no matter what the size of the school may be—in Auckland should be expected to teach a school of the same size in Wellington, Canterbury, or Otago—*i.e.*, that we should have a colonial scale of staffs?—I do not know that that is so. There are a good many considerations, as you know, in connection with the strength of a staff. In the first place, the strength of a staff would depend on the quality of the teachers; then it would depend largely on the wisdom of those who selected the staff as to its efficiency. And then, again, the results of the teaching at a school would depend upon the intelligence of the children. The same results should not be looked for from a school in the country where the attendance is bad and the children undeveloped as from a town school.

2813. Regarding the quality of the teachers, is it not a fact that the more liberal the staffing the less liberal will the salaries be—*i.e.*, the more teachers there are to be paid the less there is for each of them?—Yes, that follows. The Otago Board have been able to pay higher salaries than other Boards from the circumstance that they have a large number of large schools, and because their staffing has not been so liberal.

2814. If they staffed their schools on the basis of the most liberally staffed school district in the colony they could not pay the salaries that they are paying now?—No.

2815. When the staffing is not so liberal the Boards can afford to pay more liberal salaries, and the higher salaries attract the most efficient teachers; consequently the Boards that are offering the highest salaries now have the most efficient teachers?—That is one of the influences that are at work, but there are other influences which operate, and operate quite as powerfully as salary. For instance, there is a large number of teachers who desire to stay in the towns, and double the salary would not tempt them to go into the country.

2816. Now, with respect to the salaries paid to females, do you consider that the disparity between the salaries paid to males and females should be minimised as far as possible—*i.e.*, there should not be too large a gap between the salaries when they do equal work?—I think there is too large a gap at the present time, but I do not think it would be in the interests of the female teachers themselves to pay them the same salaries as are paid to men for doing the same class of work. We have had the greatest possible difficulty in securing the admission of a female teacher competent to do the work at a particular country school. A great many School Committees desire to have male teachers, and the only excuse this Board has had for endeavouring to place female teachers in those schools has been that the salary has been lower than would have been paid to a male teacher. If the salaries were equalised the effect, in my opinion, would be that the number of female teachers in charge of schools would be greatly diminished.

2817. The range of the disparity varies considerably. For example, in Southland we make a difference of 10 per cent. between the salaries paid to males and females; in Wanganui I think it is 25 per cent.: what do you consider would be a fair difference? Would 10 per cent. be sufficient in the small salaries and 25 per cent. in the larger salaries?—Speaking from experience, I should say that, with the exception of individual cases, our present (Wellington) scale is as much in the interests of female teachers as anything you can do. If you increase the scale the result will be that there will be practically no openings for female teachers except assistantships.

2818. Has your Board felt the want of a training institution for teachers in Wellington?—We have felt that our teachers are placed at a great disadvantage in that respect. We had a normal school here in earlier years, but did not find it satisfactory: we found that it was turning out a considerable number of teachers in a very narrow groove, and so it was abolished; and what amounted practically to a pledge was given that when a university college was established here we should have a chair of education established. We have not got it yet, but perhaps we will later on.

2819. *Mr. Hill.*] I understood you to say that you object to a colonial scale because it would bring about more anomalies than now exist; and then, at the close of Mr. Davidson's examination, you said that you agree with the principle of a colonial scale: did I understand you aright?—I do not think I went so far as you indicate. I think I said that a colonial scale would not remove anomalies; that is a different thing. Anomalies would not be removed by a colonial scale. You would still have the anomalies which I referred to—*i.e.*, difference in the cost of living, inaccessibility, &c.

2820. You mean to say that environment modifies in a great measure the conditions of existence?—Yes.

2821. You prefer the present plan to the proposed general scheme of paying salaries—you prefer the Education Boards to have the payment of the salaries in their own hands?—What I mean is this: If you have a colonial scale it must be a cast-iron scale; you will have cases of hardship occurring which you cannot remedy; you will set up a number of grievances far beyond what any one of you gentlemen seems to imagine, from the tenor of the remarks which I have seen reported in the papers—I mean the evidence that has been given. An individual Board, coming into daily contact with its teachers, and knowing its district, is in a better position to do justice to its teachers than would be possible under a scale fixed by Act, which could not be varied.

2822. In other words, an Education Board can adapt its salary scale to the special conditions and needs of the several school districts?—Yes.

2823. And from your long experience you can say that these various conditions do actually exist?—Yes, they do.

2824. You have found it necessary to give special salaries to the teachers in some districts because of certain conditions existing?—Yes.

2825. Of course, you are aware that, whatever scheme may be adopted, the great end in view is to improve education in the colony?—Yes.

2826. Have you in your office at present any applications from districts requiring schools?—At every meeting of our Board we have applications from districts requiring schools.

2827. Many of those districts, I suppose, are debarred from having schools because of the fact that they would be very costly?—The districts do not mind about the cost; the Education Board has to consider that.

2828. The Board is afraid to establish schools in certain districts because of the possible cost of maintaining small schools?—Yes.

2829. Let us assume that a colonial scale were in operation, and the Education Boards were not responsible for the maintenance of the teachers; whatever school might be opened, the teacher at that school would be paid according to the scale, not by the Education Board, but in reality by

the central department: do you think that the diminished responsibility of the Board in connection with the establishment of schools would tend to benefit education? I will put the question in a concrete form: Would your Board open schools in these districts where you say schools are difficult to open now if they were assured that those schools would be maintained without any alteration in the salaries payable in the Wellington District?—I do not think it would influence their decision at all. My Board has always considered whether the people of a district were entitled to have a school, and if the Board have been satisfied that the people were entitled to it they have invariably granted the application. There is an objection on the part of my Board to multiplying small schools, if it could see its way to avoid doing so, from the fact that the education imparted at a small school is necessarily inferior to that imparted at a large school. I do not think that the introduction of a colonial scale would have any influence at all in this district in the direction indicated—I mean that under a colonial scale the Board would not open more small schools than it would under the present system, provided that the money which a colonial scale would cost in this district over and above the present cost were placed at the disposal of the Board. I think that, with the extra money placed at its disposal, all the demands in connection with those small schools, so far as they were just, would be complied with.

2830. I understood you to say that your Board fears to open schools because of the inferior education which the pupils at those small schools would get in consequence of the inferiority of the teachers?—Not from that point of view. People in the country sometimes give voice to a feeling that everybody should have a school at his own particular door; and that is where the Board steps in. We say, "We will not place a school there; your children can attend this school or that without any great hardship."

2831. Then, you do not think that under a colonial scale more schools would be likely to be opened in places where there are no schools at present than under the present system?—I will answer in this way: If you give the Education Board of Wellington the added money which the proposed colonial scheme would cost in this district, there would be no obstacle in the way of opening any school which ought to be opened.

2832. Do you think that, instead of having a colonial scale, if the Government paid the Wellington Board, say, the original capitation grant of £4 5s., you could give teachers salaries as high as are proposed in Mr. Hogben's scale?—Yes, I have no doubt we could: I have not the least doubt.

2833. And supply all the educational needs of the district, adapting your scale to the needs of the several places?—Yes.

2834. You have paid salaries to teachers at schools where the attendance has diminished—on the original average?—Yes.

2835. Suppose the attendance had doubled at those schools instead of diminishing, would you have paid the teachers the original salaries?—No; they would have increased under the scale.

2836. Did the Education Department pay you capitation on the original average attendance or the diminished attendance?—The diminished in the one case, and the increased in the other.

2837. Suppose the attendance had kept on diminishing in the majority of instances, what must have been the result?—That salaries would have been reduced.

2838. You could not have paid your way at all?—I understand that there is no scheme formulated that does not take cognisance of this point.

2839. You think that teachers at the small schools ought to be paid the original salaries whether their average attendance falls or not?—No, I do not. That is where, as I say, the Boards can deal with a case on its merits.

2840. Do you think that when, under special conditions—say, through sickness—a district has lost its population it is advisable to pay the original salaries in such instances?—It is not necessary to do so. What we have been asking for is the power of transfer.

2841. That is exactly what I want you to express your opinion upon?—It is a power that we have exercised to some extent—I do not know whether legally or not—but we have been transferring teachers from schools where the attendance has fallen to schools which have been more appropriate to their salaries.

2842. You mean to say that if the Education Board had had the power of transfer the anomalies which have been referred to would never have existed?—That is so.

2843. You would have been able to transfer teachers to schools suitable to their capacities?—Yes.

2844. With regard to Truant Officers, I understand that you have had some experience in the employment of Truant Officers?—Yes.

2845. Have you noticed any increase in the regularity of attendance at the schools since you employed a Truant Officer?—I do not think that the question can be measured in that way. I hold that if you can show that you have forced a reasonable number of children into our schools to be educated who otherwise would not be educated you have done good work.

2846. What I wanted to bring out was a point touched upon by Mr. Robertson in his evidence. He stated that the average regularity of attendance of the children attending school had diminished when the Truant Officer was appointed?—I do not think so at all.

2847. He was correct so far as Hawke's Bay is concerned: as soon as the Truant Officer was dispensed with the average attendance went back to its original standard?—I have not regarded that as the principal benefit derived by this district from the employment of a Truant Officer, but that we have been able to get children into the schools who otherwise would have had no education at all. Our records seem to me to prove that if we had not had a Truant Officer a considerable number of children would have gone without education.

2848. You are opposed to a colonial scale?—No; but, in my opinion, an Education Board is in a better position to administer a scale of salaries than the department, which must lay down a hard-and-fast rule.

2849. Then, you would prefer the present plan?—Yes. I have no objection to a colonial scale in itself.

2850. You think that the system in vogue at the present time would be greatly improved by giving the Education Boards the right to remove teachers from one district to another?—I think that would enable them to reduce the anomalies which are always occurring. I said that our country districts are all bush districts practically. Take a place where there is a sawmill, or two sawmills: if they shut down, nearly the whole population is gone, and you are left with a school and a teacher, and probably only a few children. Unless you have the power of transferring that teacher you must pay to him or her a salary far in excess of the value of the services rendered.

2851. Then, you would take away some of the power at present exercised under the Act by School Committees?—Yes.

2852. And you think that would improve education in your district?—I am of opinion that if we had had untrammelled power of transfer we could have adjusted our difficulties.

2853. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] What building grant do you get?—Roughly speaking, £5,200 a year.

2854. Have you found that sufficient to build new schools and keep old ones in repair?—No, certainly not. The building grant, to be adequate, should be not less than £10,000 a year.

2855. Do you notice that in the first scale it is proposed to pay house allowance for teachers out of the building grant?—Then, there would be nothing left for building purposes. At the present time we have a school at the Lower Hutt which is absolutely unfit to be occupied; it is the oldest school in the district. We have the same difficulty, partially, at Carterton; we want a central school at Levin; the Newtown people want a new school there; and we have got to paint and keep in repair something like 104 schoolhouses out of a grant of £5,200 or thereabouts.

2856. How many head-teachers are there in this district for whom dwellinghouses are provided?—Comparatively few in this district.

2857. How much do you pay for house allowance?—There are four rates of payment, as far as I recollect—£10, £20, £30, and £50 per annum; the latter is the amount paid to headmasters in the town.

2858. Do you pay house allowance to the teachers at the small country schools where no houses are provided?—Yes. If that amount is taken out of the building grant there will be very little of it left.

2859. With regard to allowances to Committees, do they find the amount allowed them sufficient?—No; that is one of the unsatisfactory positions that we are in. We are continually aiding School Committees' grants; there is never a meeting at which we do not have to aid those grants by special grants.

2860. With regard to small country schools, it has been stated that they are a great cost to the Board: I understand that you call them "aided schools" up to 15 in average attendance?—Yes.

2861. Do the settlers assist in connection with those schools?—As a rule, we do not get any assistance from the settlers. In the new districts they are generally a struggling class, and have no margin for helping in that direction. There have been cases in which the teachers have received help, but such cases have been very much in a minority.

2862. Do you know that in the Wanganui District we give a capitation allowance of only £3 15s. to any school of less than 20?—Yes.

2863. I think you said that you do not think too many small schools have been built?—I think there have been too many built, but under the circumstances the difficulty is to avoid building them.

2864. *Mr. Weston.*] If there were a colonial scale of salaries, would it not follow that there should be a colonial scale for distribution of incidental allowances to the schools?—One is just as relevant as the other.

2865. For the reason that you very pertinently gave just now—that the larger districts would get more money by way of capitation than the smaller ones: the large districts would be in a state of luxury while the smaller ones would be starved?—Yes. It would operate very much in the same way as the building grant has operated. In Otago they had provision made for education before the Act came into operation; here in Wellington there was none at all.

2866. Would it not follow that with a colonial scale of salaries, and what must be the inevitable, as it seems to me, result—*i.e.*, a colonial scale for distributing the incidental allowances—the Boards would have little or nothing to do beyond seeing that the money was paid?—If you are going to deal with the question logically the paymaster is the master. If the department is going to fix the salaries and make the grants it should be in a position to redress all anomalies. If it is in that position it can make any movement of the teachers that it pleases.

2867. Would you approve of the Government appointing and otherwise dealing with teachers?—That is the usual course of democratic institutions—to gather all power into the hands of the executive until the whole thing breaks down; that has always been so.

2868. Then, in view of that fear which you have just expressed, would it not follow that, in all human probability, the present system of administering education would be better than a colonial scale of staff, salaries, and incidentals?—I am of opinion that if the department is going to undertake the fixing of the salaries it ought to have the other functions added to it; it cannot perform the one adequately and properly without the other.

2869. You think, therefore, that it will only be a question of time ere the whole scheme is carried out by the Government of the day?—I would not like to say that; I only go the length of saying that the one is the correlative of the other.

2870. Even with a colonial scale of staff and salaries, would it be likely that a Board such as your own would go further afield for a master or a mistress, when one or more of their own teachers, brought up by themselves, were adequate for the position that was vacant?—If my

Board, when considering applications for a position, had an application from a local teacher who was adequate, in their opinion, to fill the vacancy, the Board would appoint that teacher; if it had not such an applicant from among its own teachers it would go outside. I am glad to say it has taken a sufficiently liberal view to make that the practice in the past. Allegations have been made in the newspapers with regard to this question; but we can point to the fact that the headmaster of the Newtown School was brought by this Board from Hokitika; and the teacher who last occupied the position of first assistant at the Mount Cook School came from Timaru. All round there has been no disinclination whatever on the part of the Board to serve the best ends of education by bringing strangers into this district when there was not a suitable applicant from among its own teachers.

2871. When there are local teachers, trained in the district, available they have the preference?—We hold that they have the right to preference.

2872. I take it that you are not altogether at one with others who think that there should be a rigid scale of staff: would not a rigid scale interfere with a Board which, in its discretion, might think that, although a school had risen to a certain number entitling it to extra assistance, the extra assistant should not, for purposes of economy, be placed there? Would not a rigid scale interfere with a Board's discretion?—Yes, that is so. We have a case under consideration just now, in which the head Inspector says that in the interests of the school, instead of an assistant, there ought to be two pupil-teachers. Of course, that means there has been a failure of some kind in the efficiency of the staff, but it has not so far amounted—especially in the face of the special Act—to the position in which the Board can say "Resign." So that a rigid scale would interfere in that respect with the Board's power of dealing with a special case of that kind, for I presume the department would insist upon certain salaries being paid.

2873. Supposing there were, we will say, a couple of families with one or two children in each at a place in your district—a somewhat exceptional one in regard to the nature of the country—what would your Board do to insure that those children would receive education?—We have had actual cases, so I can give you facts. When an application has been made under such conditions we have said, "We will contribute £3 15s. per head of the average attendance, on the conditions that you supply adequate accommodation, that you submit the name of the teacher to the Board for approval, and that you fulfil the requirements of the Inspector." If the conditions have been complied with we have granted the £3 15s. a head capitation grant.

2874. Do you think that, with a view to securing education for the children of pioneers, even a larger provision should be made when it was found by the Board to be necessary?—Our experience would show you that there are two sides to the question. In some cases you would simply be aiding a settler who was sufficiently well off to help himself. There is this danger in helping isolated families: that you may be contributing, practically, towards the cost of a private tutor to a family quite capable of paying for education.

2875. According to your own showing there are occasions upon which children might be regarded as absolutely isolated, far away from a school, or, being near to a school, unable to get there on account of there being no roads: in such cases do you think the Board should go beyond the £3 15s. a head?—I think the Board should, as far as possible, bring education within the reach of every child in the country. I think the Boards should do whatever they can in order that every child should be educated.

2876. In the smaller schools, and in cases where you would help three or four children, would you supply the necessary apparatus and appliances?—Yes; we help them in that way fairly liberally, I think. We have always got spare furniture, maps, &c.

2877. Do you think that sufficient scolarships are awarded, for instance, by your own Board?—That opens up a very wide question. I am not quite sure about these scolarships. You start on the basis that you are going to improve the condition of the people by scholarships. Well, the question is, how do you improve the condition of the people by scholarships? Or, to put the question in another way, how do you improve the milk by taking the cream off it? Because by scholarships you take the best boys out of the people altogether, and put them into a different stratum of society. It seems to me that the whole question of education should be gone into and remodelled. For instance, take our position here with regard to the Victoria College: we have certain scholarships, and the result is going to be that the whole of the scholarships are going to go to one or two Boards, though the district is a wide one, taking in Taranaki, Nelson, the West Coast, &c. I mean to say that if you are going to have a proper system reorganization is necessasy, so that every boy and girl should have an opportunity of going right from the primary school to the university.

2878. If scholarships were abolished it would mean that a number of boys and girls who under ordinary circumstances would come to the front would remain amongst the ruck: would not that be rather a backward step for the college to take?—I do not believe that any boy or girl who has got the grit will be debarred from coming to the front in this colony.

2879. What is your opinion with regard to compassionate allowances and sick-pay to teachers, not only in your own district, but in schools generally—I need not say that, with your experience in connection with important institutions, you are better able than most men to form an accurate opinion?—My opinion is that if the teachers' institutes had been doing their duty they would have formulated a scheme long ago. They have left what is to my mind the most important question severely alone. Take the banks, for instance: with comparatively narrow constituencies they have no difficulty at all in drawing up and carrying on pension schemes.

2880. You think it would be quite possible for a scheme of pensions for teachers to be devised?—It is quite possible in the case of banks to do so, and why should not it be possible with teachers, who are very much more numerous than bank employés? The consideration involved is that the Government should, in the first instance, subscribe a certain sum of money to give the scheme a start, and then the teachers would subscribe a percentage of their salaries,

2881. It has been suggested that if a colonial scale were framed the teachers would manufacture some such scheme: do you, as a man of business, with your experience as a director of a bank, and so on, think that a colonial scale would make any real and specific difference in their ability to formulate a scheme?—No; there would be no difficulty at all in formulating a scheme in this district if the teachers got a sum from the Government equal to their share of what the Government would have to pay as a foundation for a colonial pension scheme. I may say that some of the banks contributed £25,000 as a foundation for a pension scheme, and they have had no difficulty at all in providing adequate retiring-allowances for the officers of these institutions.

2882. Under the present condition of things, what do you think would be fair consideration for a Board to show to a teacher when sick, or to the representatives of a teacher upon his death?—Previously this Board granted sick-pay up to three months' absence, but owing to the state of our finances we were compelled to reduce the time to one month; in special cases, however, we have broken through our own rule. That is the benefit of the Boards dealing with such questions rather than the Government, because the Government could not break through its rules. As I say, we have broken through our rule in deserving cases, and after the one month has expired we have granted further sick-pay.

2883. What I want to get from you is your opinion as to what would be just and right, so as to guide us in dealing with the matter should we think fit to refer to it in our report?—I am rather diffident about expressing my opinion; it would probably involve a misunderstanding. But I have had experience in connection with the matter, and my experience has been—I do not know whether it would apply to teachers—that a liberal scale of sick-allowance induces a great deal of sickness. I do not say that a liberal sick-pay allowance would operate that way with teachers, but I am speaking of my own experience.

2884. What is your opinion in regard to compassionate allowance?—That would depend largely upon the position and length of service of the teacher. I think my Board has given from six to twelve months' pay as a compassionate allowance. I do not think that twelve months' pay is an extravagant allowance to a teacher who has been for many years in the service of the Board.

2885. Does your legal adviser advise your Board that they have the power to grant compassionate allowance?—I do not know about the legal adviser, but the Audit Department, I think, says No.

2886. In view of the statesmanlike evidence which you have given, am I right in concluding that you think that the teachers, if they studied their own interests, would be satisfied with the present system of administration?—I think, myself, that if a colonial scale is introduced the teachers will awake to the fact by-and-by that they have made a great mistake—a much greater one than they have any conception of now.

Mr. Davidson: I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Teachers' Institute have considered the question of superannuation, and several schemes have been brought forward and submitted to actuaries: but, as the witness stated, until the Government are prepared to make a substantial endowment to give a scheme a start it is impracticable to introduce such a scheme. I may also say that one of the great difficulties in the way is the fact that so many different scales of salary exist in the colony at the present time.

Mr. Blair: Then, I have to beg the pardon of the teachers. I did not know that any efforts had been made in the direction of introducing a superannuation scheme. I am sorry that I have done the teachers an injustice.

2887. *Mr. Hogben.*] You said in answer to a question that one of your objections to a colonial scale was that it would imply administration by the department: in what way would the introduction of a colonial scale imply administration by the department?—I did not say that. I said that, in my opinion, the introduction of a colonial scale, governed by the hard-and-fast rules of the department, would logically involve the control of the staff by the department.

2888. The formation of a scale by the Board is not administration; it is legislation by the Board?—But it is the basis of action.

2889. It is legislation on the part of the Board?—Legislation is of no value unless it is translated into action; and when you put it into action you would have a hard-and-fast scale, in order to adjust which you would have to have the power of transferring the teachers.

2890. I would point out that there is a difference between legislation and administration. Would this introduction of a colonial scale necessarily involve the transfer of any administration to the department?—You will remember that what I said was in connection with the anomalies that would arise. If you have a hard-and-fast colonial scale, how is a Board to deal with the questions that will naturally arise under that scale?

2891. You are referring to another part of the question. I am concerned with the question that you were led to answer by Mr. Weston in reference to the administration by the department. One of the questions that he asked elicited from you some kind of answer like this: "The necessary corollary of a colonial scale was administration by the department," or words to that effect: was that not so?—I do not know what you mean.

Mr. Weston: I think what Mr. Blair said was this: that the working-out of a colonial scale of staff and salaries would if the logical outcome were acted upon, lead to the administration of the scale by the Government; but Mr. Blair was careful to say distinctly, not that that would follow, but that it was liable to follow.

Mr. Hogben: If the introduction of a colonial scale meant that any part of the administration, properly so called, would be taken away from the Boards, I could understand Mr. Blair.

Mr. Blair: I want you to understand this: I have no feeling in the matter at all.

2892. *Mr. Hogben.*] I quite understand that; but it was that question of Mr. Weston's that seemed to me to lead you to say something that you hardly meant. I am glad that I misunderstood you. With regard to the elasticity of the staff, Mr. Weston put one or two questions to you as

to whether you objected to a cast-iron rule as regards staff: do you understand that my evidence implies, as part of the proposal, that Boards should be allowed to substitute one assistant for two pupil-teachers in certain cases, or *vice versâ*, according to their discretion; also that Boards could substitute a more experienced assistant for a junior assistant and a pupil-teacher, or *vice versâ*?—I do not know what you proposed.

2893. Would not regulations such as those allow a Board as much elasticity in the modification of its staff as it is possible to devise? I can hardly think of any modification of staff which does not come under one of those heads?—Undoubtedly that would modify the position; it would meet the case that I mentioned.

2894. Would such proposals as those meet your idea of the elasticity which is necessary?—They would meet cases of that kind, but they would not meet cases of the adjustment of the staff, unless the Boards were given the power to transfer without consultation.

2895. A colonial scale need not stand or fall because of that, for that same difficulty would exist under a Board's scale, would it not? You find it existing now in the Wellington District?—Not to the same extent, because the Board advertises the vacancy, with the distinct intention of, if possible, making a transfer. That is the only way in which the difficulty can be overcome.

2896. Under the other system you would have the same power?—Yes, that is so, but it would be very inadequate.

2897. You think that that power should be extended under a colonial scale?—Yes; that would remove one of the difficulties.

2898. I think you said that Education Boards can adjust salaries to suit particular cases, whereas under a colonial scale the salaries could not be adjusted to suit particular cases: are you aware that it is the boast of Southland and Otago—and I think that North Canterbury and other districts can make practically the same boast—that they do not depart from their scales at all?—I do not know whether they can make that boast or not.

2899. Do you mean to say that they do not find the necessity of studying particular cases?—It indicates that their income has been larger than that of the Wellington Board.

2900. Southland and Otago make that boast, and North Canterbury can make nearly the same boast?—I am not dealing with Otago or Southland: I am speaking for this district.

2901. Do you think there are no special cases in other districts than Wellington?—I have nothing to do with the other districts.

2902. You are going to bring all the salaries in your district to scale, are you not?—Yes.

2903. Irrespective of particular cases?—The particular cases are those in which the attendance has suddenly fallen.

2904. But you are going to bring all the salaries to your scale, irrespective of those special cases?—Yes, so far as we can.

2905. So you are going to disregard those particular cases?—No; it is contingent upon our being able to deal with particular cases that we are going to keep to our scale. Our scale is contingent upon our ability to deal with special cases; if we cannot deal with special cases we cannot keep to a particular scale.

2906. Then, you are not going to bring them all to scale?—We have got £1,200 or £1,400 towards it from the Government; that is why we can do it. If that money is withdrawn we cannot do it.

2907. Are you going to bring those above your scale, or the proposed scale, down?—We are going to transfer the teachers, as far as we can.

2908. Do you not think that cases like that might be got over in a general colonial scale by preserving the interests of the present occupants of the offices for a certain time, every effort being meanwhile made to transfer them to places where they would be justified in receiving the salaries which they are receiving?—That is practically our policy.

2909. That should be included in a colonial scale?—If you made such a provision as that in a colonial scale it would undoubtedly modify the position considerably. We have been very much hampered, because we have not the power of transfer.

2910. You are aware that the Wellington Board has gone back in its finances during the past year?—Yes.

2911. By £4,859?—I am not sure of the amount, but it has gone back considerably.

2912. That is partly due to having paid salaries higher than its own scale?—Yes; upon an average attendance which has been declining.

2913. What was the falling-off in the average attendance in 1899?—If you go back a little further you will find that we had yearly increases of between 500 and 600, but all at once the attendance fell off in 1898 to a decrease of 39.

2914. The Wellington Board went back in its finances during 1899 by more than £4,000?—Yes, considerably.

2915. Though the average attendance increased by 351?—Yes; but it did not increase in the ratio of previous years.

2916. *The Chairman.*] You have had long experience of the schools in this district—I believe you have visited a great many: is there uniformity among the schools? Are any two schools alike, with regard to the quality of the children and the whole character of the school? Is there such a thing as entire similarity?—I think not.

2917. Schools are like everything else—there are not two alike?—The city schools are more or less alike. The tone of the school is largely given by the head-teacher and the permanency of the staff, and the country schools are diversified from the same cause. Then, in the country the schools are further diversified by the situation, by the occupation of the people, by bad attendance, by the character of the children, by the ages of the children, &c. These considerations all tend to diversify schools more or less; but, curiously enough, sometimes we come across a country school that is surprisingly well-conducted compared with other country schools; that, however, is

on account of the excellence of the teacher in charge. The buildings are fairly diversified—some are tumbling down for the want of repairs.

2918. I presume that, while a young lady can easily control one particular school in the country where the children are well behaved, it is a fairly hard job for a good master to control another school of, perhaps, no greater size in regard to the number of children, but where the children are of a different character?—You find both cases, and you find the reverse. You find lady teachers in charge of schools who are unable to control the children on account of the number of big boys; and you find the same thing in reference to masters. On the other hand, you find ladies who can control these schools just as well as any master.

2919. I suppose that almost precisely the same differences exist with regard to the calibre and the power of teachers?—Of course—the diversity of human nature.

2920. Under those circumstances, do you think it is possible to satisfactorily arrange a colonial scale of staffs?—You could put in the same number of units, but you would have to take your chance of being able to get the qualifications. You cannot possibly get every school-teacher to have the same qualifications.

2921. Do not the Inspectors, in the course of their work, sometimes report that one particular school is weaker than another—one teacher strong, and another weak?—You will find that in our Chief Inspector's last report eighty-one schools are described as satisfactory, fifty-one as fair, and thirteen as inferior.

2922. In the case of large schools, is it not found necessary occasionally to strengthen a school by adding an additional teacher?—Yes, that is so; at times we find it necessary to supplement the weakness of a head-teacher by putting in a specially strong first assistant.

2923. Then, if what has been called a rigid scale of staff were adopted for the whole of the schools in the colony, do you think it would be found to be workable—would it give satisfaction?—There would have to be the power of variation, I think; the Boards should have the power of dealing with the staff.

2924. I suppose that precisely the same objection would apply to a colonial scale of salaries, would it not?—We have not had the same difficulty with the scale of salaries. I think that where the Board has felt the disability of our present position is that they have not been able to raise the salaries of the smaller country schools.

2925. Take the case of the back-block teacher, who has been referred to already: I suppose you admit that, apart from the cost of living, there are such things as bad roads, bad weather, irregular attendance owing to the difficulties that children have in bad weather in reaching school, huge social disadvantages, the inability of the teacher to pursue his studies and prepare himself for the employment that he intends to follow: under those circumstances, do you think that even if he receives such a salary as £100 to £120 a year he is fairly paid?—I am quite satisfied that there is a great disparity between £120 in some of those places in the country and £120 in a civilised centre. Owing to the discomforts that lady teachers have to put up with in the country, in some cases they are unable to take advantage of the openings which the Board can offer them; as a matter of fact, just now we have two schools where the staff is deficient because we cannot find accommodation for lady teachers. In some cases there are no adequate lodgings available, and no residence is attached to the school. Teachers in the country are at a great disadvantage, and their salaries are not at all equal to similar salaries in the town.

2926. When vacancies occur in the town schools carrying salaries of £100 and upwards, do you receive many applications?—There are always plenty.

2927. Where do they chiefly come from?—The largest number from outside districts come from Canterbury. Recently, out of twenty applications for a position, five were from Wellington teachers, and the balance from outside.

2928. Do the applications include a good number from country teachers?—We have always a great number from the country.

2929. Headmasters?—Yes.

2930. Is there any great anxiety on the part of country teachers to get into town?—Undoubtedly; there is no question about that at all.

2931. Is there any anxiety on the part of town teachers to get into the country?—There is on the part of some young teachers, who desire to get from an assistantship to a headmastership. In the case of a great many really good openings for our lady teachers—particularly ex-pupil-teachers—we have absolutely had to get outsiders to take them. In some cases where there have been good openings for ex-pupil-teachers no applications from them have been received.

2932. With regard to the Educational Institute, has the Institute made representations to your Board at any time with reference to either salaries or other complaints?—The only representation made by them that I can recollect at the moment was in connection with the Technical School—pointing out that it was absorbing a certain amount of salary-money. I am not sure whether it was in the form of a communication to the Board or a report in the newspapers.

2933. A very large amount of money that otherwise would have been distributed amongst the teachers has been withdrawn from primary education and handed over to the Technical School?—It has been said that the amount has been about £1,100 a year. Of course, the defence of the Board is that the Technical School work is essentially primary educaticn. This question of technical education is one that has been creating a great deal of agitation and discussion.

2934. It has been stated that a good many of the teachers themselves have benefited by the Techhical School: do you know whether that is the case?—I think so. We have endeavoured, as far as possible, to place the various classes at the disposal of the teachers. It has been largely with a view to benefit primary education that the school has been carried on.

2935. *Mr. Hill.*] Have the teachers been granted special facilities to attend the Technical School?—We have had special classes for the teachers, and have paid their fares from the country to enable them to attend those classes.

2936. *The Chairman.*] Is it due to the school that drawing-lessons have been conducted in a very satisfactory way all over the district?—Yes; I think that is undisputed.

2937. Have the teachers also received instruction in singing through the medium of the Technical School?—Yes.

2938. They have had this instruction free?—Yes.

2939. I think you have already expressed the opinion that it would be a good thing if Education Boards were elected by the people?—I have a strong opinion that the present system of electing Education Boards is an anomalous one: it is entirely wrong. The people themselves should elect the Education Boards, and the people then would have an opportunity of expressing their opinion as a people, and of placing proper representation on the Boards.

2940. I presume you think that a method of popular election would increase the interest that the people now take in education?—I think so. It has done so in London.

2941. Do you think it would be desirable to have a regulation passed providing that schools should not be placed within a certain distance of each other—say, two or three miles?—There is a regulation to that effect now.

2942. The Board's regulation?—I think it is under the Act.

2943. Has not the Board power to erect a school within a lesser distance of another school than that if it thinks the case demands it?—Yes; if the case demands it—for instance, take the city schools.

2944. The Board has a discretionary power now?—Yes; it is provided, either by the Board's regulations or the Act, that no school shall be placed within three or five miles of another, except in the case of town schools.

2945. Would it be well to remove that discretionary power, do you think, seeing that in many cases there are huge mountain-ranges or rivers intervening?—I do not think it would operate at all in this district: it would not be applicable at all. At Kahautaia there are two schools quite close at hand, where, if there was a bridge across the river, the Ruamahanga School would suffice.

2946. But in the absence of a bridge the two schools must be maintained?—The children used to go over the river in a sort of flat-bottomed boat; but we had to discourage that, lest we might be responsible for the drowning of some of the children.

2947. To sum up the whole matter, do you think that, on the whole, a colonial scale of salaries, controlled by a central department, would be found to be equitable or just to the teachers, or give satisfaction to the people themselves?—I cannot answer that. I am distinctly of opinion that if the Board is properly constituted, and has the means at its disposal, it is in a better position—I am speaking particularly with regard to Wellington—to give satisfaction to its teachers, and could better control education in the district, than would be the case if there were a hard-and-fast scale of salaries, because that involves also, I understand, the placing of the Inspectors under the control of the department.

2948. No, that is not so. Are you aware that the Inspectors themselves, at one of their conferences, passed a resolution in favour of being placed under a central department?—I suppose they want to get out of control, like all the other authorities.

2949. Do you know anything of the Educational Institute—whether it represents the teachers of the country as well as of the city, or whether it is exclusive or open?—I do not know. I know that they are a very active body here in Wellington, but I do not know whether they represent the country teachers or the town ones.

2950. You do not know whether many country teachers attend the meetings or take any active part in connection with it?—No.

2951. *Mr. Hill.*] Has the Wellington Board any regulation limiting the size of the schools: what is the greatest average attendance at any Wellington school?—About 900.

2952. You do not limit the size to, say, 600 or 700?—We have not been called upon to decide such a question.

FRIDAY, 28TH JUNE, 1901.

A. DORSET further examined.

2953. *Mr. Davidson.*] I find that in the Wellington District there are twenty-five schools in which the average attendance is under 15?—Yes.

2954. What is the Board's regulation as far as salary is concerned in regard to such schools? They are usually treated as aided schools.

2955. Your regulations allow £3 15s. for each unit in the school?—Yes; we help the smaller schools as much as possible.

2956. Then, each of the schools would be improved to the extent of £1 5s. per unit under the new scale?—Yes.

2957. Then, these twenty-five schools would be materially benefited?—Yes.

2958. In the next class there are eighteen small country schools which would benefit from £10 to £30 per year?—Either of the proposed scales would improve the small schools.

2959. There are twelve other schools for which your scale allows £80 per year, but the suggested scale gives from £120 to £130, so they would benefit?—Yes.

2960. There are fourteen schools with averages from 25 to 30: under your scale you allow £100 for those schools, and the suggested scale provides for £130 to £140?—Yes; they would benefit.

2961. That is to say, that sixty-nine schools, or nearly half of the schools in the Wellington District, have an average below 30, and would be benefited very materially under the suggested scale?—No doubt.

2962. Are these the schools that should be benefited under any scheme?—Yes.
2963. You will notice that for an increase of one scholar an increase of £55 is given?—Yes.
2964. Under the suggested scale the increase is by units: do you think it is preferable to pay by units?—I do not know. I think that the steps might be closer in the scale.
2965. It is not peculiar to the Wellington District that these smaller schools are underpaid: the same thing exists right throughout the colony?—Yes.
2966. You would approve of a scheme drawn up by this Commission which would increase the salaries for such schools as those throughout the colony?—Yes.
2967. *Mr. Hogben.*] I ask for a return of expenses of your Board irrespective of teachers' salaries and allowances, &c.?—I produce the return [Exhibit 109].
2968. *The Chairman.*] You have been asked about the small schools: have there been a good many applications from time to time for the establishment of small schools in outlying places under the Wellington Board's jurisdiction?—Quite a number.
2969. Is much pressure brought to bear on members of Boards in order to get those schools?—I think there is.
2970. Has the Board frequently, after due inquiry, refused applications for such schools?—Yes.
2971. At the meeting before last of the Wellington Board do you remember any applications being refused?—Yes; two.
2972. Do you recollect the grounds of refusal?—That the attendance in one case was not sufficiently large, and in the other case the bridging of a river and roading would give access to the existing school.
2973. What attendance was expected for those schools?—I could not answer that just now.
2974. The members of the Board were guided by the report of their Inspector, I suppose?—I certainly think so.
2975. Was it considered by the Board that if the parents used a little exertion they would be able to avail themselves of the educational advantages in the district?—Yes; and the Board offered to contribute to the expenses of children attending such schools.
2976. I suppose the measures that are adopted by the Board are modified from time to time to meet the circumstances?—Yes, certainly.
2977. Has not the Board sometimes advanced a small amount of capitation-money to the parents to enable them to furnish horses to carry children to school?—Yes, that has been done. Every effort is made to get children to the nearest school. Every case is dealt with on its merits.
2978. If the Board were to respond to every demand of this kind, what would the result be financially?—You would have no money for building larger schools, and there would be considerable strain to pay salaries.
2979. It would lead to a large increase of expenditure?—Decidedly so.
2980. Are applications occasionally made to assist so-called teachers who are virtually tutors and governesses in private families?—Yes.
2981. If the Board understands the circumstances, are the applications granted or refused?—They are sometimes granted, the Board recognising that the settlers have a fair claim. The condition is that the school assisted must be a public school open to any child.
2982. Are there other applications where no benefit would be given except to a private person?—I do not think so.
2983. Has the Board endeavoured to encourage or discourage the establishment of small schools?—To encourage, where it is the only means of providing education for children.
2984. But supposing other means are available?—Then they discourage it.
2985. If schools were multiplied in the outlying settlements in the way demanded sometimes by the settlers, what, in your opinion, would be the effect on the schools already in existence?—They would practically be denuded in many instances.
2986. Instead of moderate-sized schools you would have a whole crowd of weak and inferior ones?—Yes; and too close together, as many are now.
2987. Do you know how many School Committees there are in the Wellington District?—About 145.
2988. How many Committees have you in the city?—Seven.
2989. Do those Committees represent many parents?—Oh, yes.
2990. But take the country districts: do the Committees there represent parents of many children?—In some schools the attendance is very small.
2991. Are you of the same opinion as the Chairman of the Wellington Board, that it would be a great improvement if Boards were made elective on a broad and wide franchise?—I certainly think so.
2992. Do you think it is reasonable that a Committee representing half a dozen or a dozen parents should have the same elective power and control of the Board as a Committee representing large schools in the city?—No.
2993. *Mr. Hill.*] How much subsidy is paid by the various districts in Wellington—that is, for small country schools under 15?—In most instances the subsidy is arranged to include free board and lodging.
2994. But you do not require those Committees to pay these amounts into the Board's funds?—No; I believe the average payment to these Committees is £40 a year.

T. R. Fleming, M.A., LL.B., Inspector of Schools, examined.

2995. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you find that boys are entering the teaching profession in the Wellington District?—Not to the extent that we would like to see. Generally speaking, the boys offering do not equal the girls.
2996. Would you mind looking at page 8 of the Minister's report for 1899: you will see a table there of teachers' salaries for 1899?—Yes.

2997. You see in that report that there are, apart from pupil-teachers, 1,023 certificated teachers in the colony receiving under £100: do you not think that the knowledge of that fact deters the right kind of boys from entering the teaching profession?—Yes.

2998. How many teachers out of the 3,812 mentioned in this report are receiving between £300 and £400?—I think the number is fifty-eight according to this return.

2999. How many receive £400?—Four.

3000. Do you think that the inducement for boys to become teachers, and for the best class of men who are teachers to remain in the service, is sufficient?—Certainly not.

3001. Is it your opinion that a large section of the public imagine that there are a number of teachers in the colony receiving salaries of £500 and upwards?—I could not answer that.

3002. What is your opinion as to the salaries for schools with an average attendance under 30?—They are not nearly sufficient.

3003. Have you seen the alternative scale suggested?—Yes.

3004. You will notice there that the staffing allowed for schools up to 40 is a sole teacher: do you consider that sufficient or not?—I recognise it is a question of finance. As an ideal it is certainly not sufficient, but we have to consider a great many questions.

3005. Do you think that a thoroughly competent teacher can efficiently manage a small country school having an average up to 40?—A teacher in a school of 40 or up to 58 (with average below 40, and having eight or nine classes) is, I consider, the hardest worked in the service.

3006. The staff suggested here is that obtaining in the Wellington District, is it not?—I find that the staffing in the suggested scale tallies very nearly, except in one place in which it is less than our scale.

3007. I was speaking of schools up to 40, in which it corresponds exactly with the Wellington scale for head-teachers?—Yes.

3008. Take the next group (40 to 90); the Wellington scale (41 to 71) provides for a head-teacher and a pupil-teacher: do you think that a pupil-teacher is the right class of assistant to come in at that stage?—No.

3009. Would you prefer an assistant?—Yes.

3010. Then, you would prefer the suggested scale in this respect: is that so?—Yes.

3011. In a mixed school having an average of over 500 the Fourth Standard would probably have an average of from 60 up to 70?—Yes.

3012. Is the average woman physically capable of managing classes in a mixed school from Standard IV. upwards?—No.

3013. But you think there are exceptional women who may sometimes be able to manage the higher standards?—Yes.

3014. In a staff drawn up by such a Commission as this, would you make the staff so elastic as to allow a woman to take such standards?—Yes.

3015. Would you make a hard-and-fast rule that women must not take such work?—No.

3016. The average woman is physically incapable of doing such work?—Yes.

3017. In separate schools, where the sexes are separate, do you think women can manage girls up to any standard?—Yes, with slight modifications. I would not feel so certain of them, even with girls, as good male teachers.

3018. Do you think male and female teachers should receive equal pay?—No.

3019. How many female teachers have to be trained for each one that remains permanently in the service?—I should say that one in four (which some one has stated to be the proportion) was under the mark.

3020. Is the cost of training women teachers equal to the cost of training men?—It is more.

3021. The State is the loser by women going out of the profession so often?—Yes; and often schools are deranged in consequence.

3022. Do women require sick-leave more frequently and for longer periods than men?—Much more.

3023. These are two reasons why you would not give equal pay to women?—Certainly.

3024. Is the disparity between the salaries of men and women too great?—Yes.

3025. Would you suggest that this disparity be very considerably reduced?—Yes; but I have not gone into the percentage in this scale.

3026. I understand you to say you would not equalise the salaries of the sexes, but would make them approach more closely than they do at the present time?—Yes.

3027. Are you in favour of a uniform scale of salaries and staffing for the whole colony?—Speaking as an abstract principle, I say Yes.

3028. Do you know of any other colony having different scales of salaries and staffing?—No.

3029. Are there uniform scales in Australia?—Yes.

3030. And in the States of America?—Yes.

3031. *Mr. Stewart.*] Is the Commission to understand from your answer just now that you believe in the principle of a colonial scale as just and equitable?—I said I was in favour of it as an abstract principle.

3032. Supposing that a colonial scale was drawn up by this Commission and approved by Parliament, do you think that would weaken the Boards' control over the teachers, even though the Boards pay them and retain their right of making appointments, and that the Boards have the power of removing teachers?—I cannot say that I have gone into this question of a colonial scale from that point of view, consequently my opinion would not be worth anything.

3033. From your knowledge of affairs generally, do you think that the teachers of New Zealand are anything like satisfied with the present rates of pay?—I do not think they are.

3034. You said there is a great disparity between the salaries of men and women, and that it should be lessened?—Yes.

3035. Do you think that the women teachers of the Wellington District are anything like adequately paid?—No.

3036. Then, the suggested scale would receive your approval in lessening that disparity?—Yes.

3037. How many years have you been inspecting in this district?—Eleven years.

3038. You have seen progress of settlement going on?—Yes.

3039. Do you think the cost of living at Pahiatua and other parts is as high to-day as it was eleven years ago?—I really have not gone into the question, but I do not think it is.

3040. Are the roads and general means of communication in the Wellington Province being steadily improved?—Yes.

3041. Is it probable that with the improved means of communication the cost of living is lessened?—Yes.

3042. In drawing up a scale of salaries for the future it will not be wise to take into consideration small differences in the cost of living?—Perhaps not, as regards the cost of living only.

3043. Do you think that during the eleven years you have been inspecting it is very probable that the cost of living in the different districts has been reduced?—Yes.

3044. Looking at the question of the cost of living from the standpoint of town and country, do you think that there are factors in each place which tend to equalise matters—that is to say, high rent in town, and so on?—I will not answer that question "yes" or "no," because some of the country teachers with house allowance or rent are certainly far better off than those in town.

3045. Take, for instance, the teacher at Masterton: he is really in a much better position than many head-teachers in Wellington?—I should say so.

3046. Has your Board any definite scheme of effecting promotions?—I think the Chairman of the Board told you yesterday that the Board advertises vacancies, and that the teachers taken were those who could show length of service and good certificates. The best of such teachers would get the position.

3047. Do you think that in appointing pupil-teachers the opinion of the Inspectors ought to be taken?—Certainly. I may say that this year our Board has for the first time submitted to us the names of applicants for pupil-teacherships in the city, but not so with regard to country appointments.

3048. In the past the selection of pupil-teachers in Wellington has not been satisfactory, but it has improved in regard to the town, and not in the country?—That is practically so.

3049. Considering the necessity for education in these country districts, do you not think that there ought to be a reform in this matter?—Undoubtedly. I think we should have a training-college at the different centres, so that teachers could be trained there for the country service.

3050. In any case you would not advocate employment of pupil-teachers until your Inspectors had had an opportunity of judging as to their abilities?—No, I would not.

3051. You have those facilities now?—Yes. Our Board has got over the difficulty as well as it can; but we have work to do in different parts of the district, and that prevents us supervising to any extent the training of pupil-teachers.

3052. As to the male pupil-teachers, boys are not so good as girls?—Not as a rule—I mean, judging from the work done in the schools.

3053. Do you think you get the best class of boys, or do you think that, in consequence of many varying factors, you do not get the best class?—I do not think we get the best class.

3054. It is really necessary to encourage the employment of the best class of boys?—Undoubtedly.

3055. Do you think that the provision made for a working-average helps materially in cases of epidemic, &c.?—Yes, in some cases. It does justice in some cases in connection with country schools.

3056. Would you favour raising the working-average to three-fifths of the roll instead of half?—Yes, in the circumstances.

3057. Do you think that payment on average attendance is just to the teachers?—No; I think a better and more just basis would be the roll-numbers.

3058. Are you in favour of the Inspectors being placed under the central department?—No. The Inspectors at their last conference resolved in favour of that, but at the conference in 1894 they decided against it. In both cases I voted in favour of Inspectors remaining as they are at present.

3059. We have no evidence from any Inspector as to why he voted against the proposal?—Well, I consider that amongst the best part of an Inspector's work is going round advising teachers. It seems to me that under present arrangements Inspectors are better able to do that. It is possible some satisfactory system might be arranged by the department, but at present I am against the proposed change.

3060. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Is it not likely that in districts where the same Inspectors remain for a number of years, teachers get into the ways and methods of Inspectors?—Yes, but that can be very easily remedied. I think it is a mistake for a Board to have only one Inspector.

3061. How would you get over the difficulty in the case of small Boards, where perhaps there is hardly work enough for one Inspector?—I do not see there is any necessity for a change in the direction indicated. An Inspector on a Board such as the Westland or Taranaki would do quite as good work under the Board as under the department. Besides, in cases of removal by a department, it must not be forgotten that it takes an Inspector some time to understand his district.

3062. Would such changes lead to uniformity in the work of the inspections, and of the educational work generally?—I do not quite see what you mean by "uniformity."

3063. Well, judging by Inspectors' reports, the systems in vogue throughout the colony are as different as chalk and cheese?—Discussing this matter in conference, the Inspectors found that there was nothing like the difference which some people seemed to think existed. As to uniformity, in one sense I am dead against it.

3064. Are you opposed to uniformity in the assignment of marks?—I do not see how putting the Inspectors under the department would remedy that. Each Inspector, as it is, gives his opinion, and how would that be altered under the department? The question was discussed by the Inspectors in conference, and it was agreed to observe certain rules.

3065. I understand from the Otago Inspectors that they still intend to adhere to the system in use by them in the past?—I cannot answer for the Inspectors of Otago.

3066. Do you consider that the adoption of a colonial scale of salaries will tend to have the effect that teachers will regard their salaries as having a permanency which does not exist at the present time?—I think you might ask the teachers that.

3067. Would you oppose the interests of the teachers if they passed a resolution affirming that a colonial scale was in their interests?—If the teachers thought it was in their interests, and I thought it was against their interests, I would oppose it.

3068. Do you not think it would lead to contentment on the part of teachers if such a scale were adopted?—I have said I am in favour of the principle.

3069. Do you consider that the allocation of the extra 5s. to the various Boards will tend to remove anomalies now existing in the salaries of teachers?—Speaking for our Board, I think the best will be done to remove anomalies; but that does not mean that I am in favour of the 5s. instead of a colonial scale.

3070. If the £4 is given to a strong Board it would be able to increase its salaries?—Undoubtedly; there is no question about that. I cannot see how the grant will satisfy Greymouth, Westland, or Taranaki.

3071. Do you think that the minimum certificates under the scale are too high?—I would like to look at the scale further before expressing an opinion as to that.

3072. Do you consider that the Inspectors should have power or authority to reduce teachers' certificates?—No.

3073. Inspectors are not unanimous on that point?—Well, my reason is that if you are making a selection of a teacher from another Board the best thing to go by is the last report of the Inspector. I do not think you should degrade a man publicly by reducing his certificate.

3074. Would you support a system of bonus on certificates?—Our scale practically means that up to a certain extent. Perhaps, on the whole, I should like to see some encouragement given to teachers to improve their certificates, as my experience is that many teachers get a certain certificate required, and unless there is some incentive they do not proceed further.

3075. Do you suggest that some incentive should be given?—I think Mr. Hogben's plan is a very good one.

3076. Do you consider that the granting of a bonus on certificates, as adopted by the Wanganui Board, is likely to cripple to finances of the Board?—That is another question. Perhaps the incentive given to the teacher might be quite sufficient without a bonus. I have not made up my mind with regard to the advisability of giving bonuses.

3077. You favour the establishment of training-colleges at the large centres?—Undoubtedly I do.

3078. Would that be preferable to the establishment of a chair of pedagogy in the university?—I think both are desirable. Training-colleges ought to be worked in conjunction with the university. Mr. Hogben, in his address to the Inspectors, said: "Under the heading of 'Training-schools' we read, 'It will become a question for consideration in the near future whether definite training for all teachers should not be provided by the State. In the case of the four large centres it will be possible to co-ordinate this with the work of the university colleges; at the smaller centres those who cannot by scholarships or otherwise find admission to the four chief normal schools should likewise have the opportunity of undergoing a regular course of training.'" And, further, "The director of the training-college should be lecturer also in psychology and in the history of education, both of which subjects should be broadly but not exhaustively treated, with a view to their influence in the making of intelligent and thoughtful teachers." We have considered the question, and I fully agree with what Mr. Hogben says there.

3079. In the case of the smaller towns, such as Wanganui, New Plymouth, and Napier, what do you suggest in place of a training-college?—I think the colleges at the four centres ought to be sufficient to provide for the wants of the smaller places, if teachers were sent to the country from these centres.

3080. Do you think the Board should have full power to transfer teachers in its district?—Yes; I find there is great difficulty in working schools without this power.

3081. Respecting the requirements of the syllabus, do you favour a differentiation between the work expected from the scholars of town and country schools?—Yes, undoubtedly.

3082. Under the suggested scale (No. 1), when the attendance reaches 20 the headmaster is to lose £10 from his salary to pay a sewing-mistress: is that equitable?—No.

3083. Would you favour uniformity in the pupil-teachers' examinations?—We have already expressed our opinion in conference on this point. I think it would be better if the department took charge of this work, and so have the same system all over the colony.

3084. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you think that the university colleges could be utilised as training-colleges through the establishment of a chair of pedagogy?—I think it is practicable.

3085. *Mr. Hill.*] Did I understand you to say that in schools of the same average attendance the salaries should be the same throughout the colony?—Well, broadly speaking, yes. But there are exceptional cases where the schoolmaster is deserving of a higher salary. One such case has been before the Commission in which the average attendance is given as only 14. In 1889 that

school presented for examination 38 children; in 1900, 52; and last year, 59. It is not fair to judge of a teacher's work by the average which has been set down for this school. The teacher is doing far more work than the stated average would indicate.

3086. But, as a general principle, you think that schools having the same average attendance should carry the same salaries?—Yes.

3087. You said there are some cases where some differentiation should be made in the matter of allowances?—Yes, some such power should be given.

3088. You notice there are thirteen Boards in the colony?—I think there are too many.

3089. Do you think there should be a merging in certain cases?—Yes.

3090. Do you really find that men control schools better than women?—Yes, certainly, I should prefer a man to a woman in charge of a school. In the smallest schools of all I should often prefer a woman.

3091. Up to what average attendance do you think it is desirable to have a woman in the school as sole teacher?—Up to an average of 40—taking the scale.

3092. Above 40 what would you suggest?—I do not know that a man might not do a little above that.

3093. In the case of the larger schools, where do you think the woman is best?—In charge of the infant department. That is one feature of Mr. Hogben's scale which I rather like.

3094. Would you not like a woman to teach above Standard II.: is that so?—I think she might take Standard III.

3095. As regards assistants, have you any women taking, say, Standard VI.?—Yes.

3096. And Standard V. also?—Yes.

3097. Would you suggest that under the new scale women should be debarred from taking the higher standards?—No.

3098. Would you limit the teaching by lady teachers up to Standard IV.?—I do not think it is necessary to do so.

3099. Is it your experience that women can do the work required of them as well as men?—No. I have said that in large schools the average woman can do the work up to Standard IV., but above that you want exceptional women for the work.

3100. If the man in mixed schools has to teach Standards VI. and V., do you find that he is as capable of managing the girls in those classes as well as a woman and as efficiently?—Not altogether. There are differences in temperament.

3101. Do you think that women's influence in the school will operate beyond their ordinary instruction?—Yes.

3102. With reference to certificates, are you of the opinion that, in order to foster literary attainment, something should be given—say, a bonus?—If you mean as some incentive to prosecute study, I say Yes.

3103. Would you give them a money bonus?—No.

3104. Some special certificate as an incentive?—Perhaps.

3105. You think men should pursue their studies from the love of it—which brings its own reward?—Yes; but some incentive is generally necessary.

3106. Is it literary knowledge or skill that characterizes the successful teacher?—Both.

3107. Do you find that literarary knowledge always goes with technical skill?—No; they are separate.

3108. In order to be a successful teacher, must there not be a specialisation of the man's knowledge?—A man entering the teaching profession should go in for the science of education.

3109. In order to become a teacher, is it absolutely necessary for him to possess a certain amount of knowledge?—Yes.

3110. A teacher is wanted for a certain school, and you have two men holding the same certificates, but one has graduated: do you think the advantage would be to the man who has the highest certificate?—The advantage would undoubtedly be to the man with the literary knowledge, other things being equal.

3111. Is it the literary knowledge or the certificate showing his literary knowledge which is of benefit to him, even though he is not classified?—I do not think it gives the graduate the more chance unless it is incorporated with the certificate, because when it is put before the Committees they do not really understand what the whole thing means.

3112. Do you think they understand the present extraordinary system of classification?—They do not need to understand how the grading of the certificate is determined, but only the rank of the certificate.

3113. Would you suggest the continuation of the present system of classification?—I think I would simplify it a little. I think the E certificate might very well be raised.

3114. Would you suggest the establishment (in the country as well as in the town) of a preparatory school, whereby those who desire to become teachers could anticipate the teaching profession by preparation before entering as pupil-teachers?—I have not considered that question carefully. There are a great many things to be said in that connection. The Education Department is now advocating the establishment of high schools throughout the district, and we hope to get better material for the teaching profession as a result. We must get the best material, no matter where it comes from, and if the country material is not good enough we must get it from somewhere else. Training-colleges, when provided, ought to meet the requirements.

3115. *Mr. Smith.*] You favour the proposal made at the last conference to have pupil-teachers trained?—Yes.

3116. I suppose you know that the proposal was negatived by that conference by only one vote: what advantage would accrue from having pupil-teachers trained by the Boards?—It would hurry the department to establish training-colleges.

3117. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you think there is too much uniformity in our present system of education in the primary schools?—I think I should like to see a little more uniformity in the examination of pupil-teachers; but I would like the standard syllabus to be a little more varied, and the headmaster given more choice.

3118. If you think the syllabus should be more varied, would it not mean that pupil-teachers should not be brought under a dead uniformity system of examination?—The examination itself might be just as varied as the syllabus.

3119. If the teachers are to be examined by the central department, I presume there would be one syllabus for all the pupil-teachers: would not the examiners be appointed for the whole colony, and would not the same questions be distributed throughout the colony?—Yes.

3120. Would that not engender dead uniformity?—No. At present the teachers' certificates are all done by one examination all over the colony. Such a syllabus should be drawn up so as to give variety.

3121. I apprehend you to mean that the object of a certificate is to enable the holder to assert a just claim to positions as they may offer?—Yes.

3122. Therefore a certificate, *plus* Inspectors' reports, would be the man's passport?—Yes.

3123. If a certificate is to be a man's passport, would it not necessarily follow that as a teacher deteriorated, either from direct causes or from age, such certificate should be lessened in value?—I consider such a reduction would be an act of degradation. I strongly reprobate any such course.

3124. Then, would it not be more just for a man or woman starting in the profession to receive a certificate, such as a lawyer gets, and with it leave him to fight the battle of life as best he can?—Then you would have enormous difficulties.

3125. You have said you would rely on the Inspector's judgment whether a man should be appointed?—We must have evidence that a teacher would be up to the work required of him. A certificate does not show the faculty of organization at all, and that is one of the most important considerations in making the appointment.

3126. Do you believe in pupil-teachers being engaged in teaching?—No, not at first.

3127. What do you think should be the course that a boy or girl aiming to become a teacher should pursue?—I would advocate that they come prepared with as good a literary knowledge as possible. At present our regulations are not severe enough to test whether they are sufficiently equipped. They should do a little teaching, and then go through a training-college.

3128. Do you think that more scholarships should be offered than is the case at present?—Well, that, again, is a question of finance. I should like to see a larger number of scholarships, but there is also a question of age. Certain scholarships should be offered for children under thirteen, and again for those under fifteen. No scholarship should lead straight from the primary school to the university. Children should go from the primary to the secondary school, and thence to the university by another examination.

3129. And those scholarships should be multiplied?—Yes.

3130. Do you think that one cause of boys' disinclination to act as pupil-teachers is a dread of the "grind" they must undergo to qualify themselves?—I do not quite see that.

3131. If that is not an element, can you tell us what is the cause of boys holding back so?—Well, they know that it may be many years before they receive even £100 a year.

3132. It is rather a want of confidence in their future career?—Not altogether; partly that.

3133. Then, what is the reason?—I cannot say anything definite.

3134. As to incidental allowances to Committees: if we have a colonial scale of salaries, would it not be just that there should be a colonial scale of incidentals, seeing that the larger schools get more money?—That is rather a difficult question to answer.

3135. But you will admit that the whole of the schools in the colony ought to receive equal justice?—Yes.

3136. Assuming that the colonial scale is passed, and it is based on my friend's lines, will it follow as a matter of course that small schools of, say, 5 children as the minimum average will receive enough to equip them and give the children a proper education?—I do not see how it can, as £5 will not be enough.

3137. Then, you come back to your statement that small schools must have special consideration?—Yes, that is so.

3138. Are there cases in your own district where it would be essential to give special help to, say, a couple of families who, by reason of bad roads and other circumstances, cannot send their children to school?—There are several such cases in our district where we do give help.

3139. You support Mr. Blair's statement that those cases ought to be considered just as much as those having a larger attendance?—They should be considered, certainly.

3140. In all schools is it not essential, in considering the size of the staff, to regard special circumstances?—Yes.

3141. Do you think that the same elasticity that the Boards would probably give might be expected from the Government administering a hard-and-fast colonial scale?—No.

3142. Do you think that in our schools generally, with a colonial scale of staffing and salaries, there would be the same earnest work bestowed by teachers as at present?—I do not think it will make difference in that respect. It would give teachers a better tenure of office, which they ought to have.

3143. You do not think it would weaken their efforts in school-work?—Not a bit in that way.

3144. Supposing a lady were at the head of a school, and an assistant was needed, would you place the man in a subordinate position to the lady, or would you remove the lady, and appoint a man in charge?—I think I would put in a female teacher.

3145. A school grows to be beyond the reach, according to scale, of a lady teacher: what would you do when an extra teacher was required?—I think I would put in a female to assist.

3146. Might it not be the case that there would be a class of child in the school which, in the opinion of the Committee, required the services of a man rather than of a woman?—Yes; there are many disadvantages both ways.

3147. Then, in such case, what would you do with the lady? I presume you would not expect the man to work under the lady?—I said I would put in a female teacher, or make the best arrangement possible.

3148. Supposing it were necessary to put in a male teacher, what would you do with the lady?—I would try to put her in another school.

3149. Then, you would put a man under her?—No, not necessarily. Everything in such a case would depend upon the special circumstances of the case.

3150. *Mr. Hogben.*] You expressed the opinion that, with regard to staffing, there would not be so much elasticity under a colonial scale as under Boards?—Yes, that is my opinion; I was taking your first scale, which I thought was too rigid.

3151. Supposing that the Board was allowed to substitute for two pupil-teachers one certificated teacher?—That would certainly lessen the rigidity.

3152. Again, supposing Boards were allowed to substitute for a pupil-teacher and a junior teacher one strong teacher (instead of the two), would that strengthen the staff?—Undoubtedly, yes.

3153. Or, again, supposing the Board was allowed to substitute for a teacher a pupil-teacher, and to add £45 to the salary of another teacher so as to give more experience, would that be an advantage?—Quite so.

3154. Can you tell me any changes in a staff which would not come under that head?—I cannot remember any change that we have made which would not come under one of these three heads.

3155. Supposing those conditions were inserted in a colonial scale with a limitation, would it not meet possible or likely cases?—Our scale allows one assistant instead of two pupil-teachers, or *vice versâ*. There is no limitation: it is at the discretion of the Inspector.

3156. You do not think it advisable to increase the number of pupil-teachers?—No.

3157. How would you limit it, then?—I suppose you could not do it any other way than by drawing up a scale as you suggest.

3158. Do other districts besides Wellington generally make special arrangements in cases like that of Pongaroa?—I cannot answer for other districts.

3159. Do they depart from the scale?—I do not know.

3160. I understood you to say there ought to be a uniform scale of allowances to the Committees?—Yes.

3161. Are fires needed as much in the north as in the south of New Zealand?—No.

3162. Does a school in a dry district like South Canterbury require cleaning so much as schools in other districts?—That all depends on the state of the roads, and other things.

3163. Does not firewood cost very much more in some places than in others?—Yes.

3164. Would not that make a good deal of difference in the needs of Committees?—Those are some of the factors to be taken into consideration.

3165. It would make such a difference as to necessitate a difference in any scale drawn up allowing grants to the various Committees?—I dare say it would.

3166. Then, how could such a scale stand on all-fours with a scale of salaries?—All I can say is that I certainly think that Boards are better able to deal with incidental expenses.

3167. With certain modifications, and such changes as I have indicated, you do not see any difficulty in working the colonial scale?—No, certainly not—that is, working it as a scale. I would like to give a headmaster full discretion in the management of his school.

3168. Is it desirable to have separate schools for boys and girls and infants?—I think the headmaster should have control of the infant-schools, instead of, as at present, in a few cases where the infant mistress is practically the head. In such cases the transfer of children to the higher classes does not work so smoothly as where the headmaster has full control.

3169. *Mr. Hall.*] You have a Girls' School at Mount Cook: do you think it is desirable to adopt mixed schools?—Yes; that Girls' School was established because it was thought desirable by many parents to have a separate school in so large a district, and doubtless it gives satisfaction to some people who desire it.

3170. You would not close that school?—No; there might be some parents so much prejudiced against a mixed school that they still prefer to send their children to the Girls' School.

3171. Would you suggest that some such schools should be merged?—I prefer a mixed school.

3172. In any case, you think the various departments ought to be under the direct control of the headmaster?—Yes; but in the special case of our Girls' School in Wellington I would not disturb existing arrangements as to control.

3173. In the case of infant departments you would have them under the control of the headmaster?—Yes, certainly. It would do away with the chances of friction.

3174. *The Chairman.*] You mean that where there are separate boys' and girls' schools existing you would not interfere unless an amalgamation or alteration was brought about by the action of the parents and Committees?—If the parents and Committees wished an amalgamation I should advocate it, but not otherwise.

3175. In the scale of staffing salaries as proposed you will notice that there are twenty-six grades or classes: might not that number be advantageously reduced?—I do not see that it matters.

3176. You will notice, too, that for smaller schools there is a unit system by which the salaries of teachers in such schools are liable to be reduced or increased from £1 to £5 for each

child: is that an improvement on the system at present in use in this district? Do you think teachers' salaries should be allowed to fluctuate in that manner?—I certainly think that in certain schools it would be better to have a fixed scale. You might have it fluctuating above a certain grade.

3177. The principle adhered to in this scale is "the more pupils the more pay": do you think that principle should be paramount, or should we go on the principle of equal pay for equal work; or, to put it another way, in small schools you might have very hard work for the teacher, in a large school the work is not so heavy, and yet because there are more pupils in that school the teacher's salary is greater?—The teacher's salary ought not to be affected in that way in the small schools, but responsibility must be taken into account.

3178. According to the scheme now proposed, any fully certificated teacher can be appointed to the charge of any school irrespective of its size?—I have not noticed that.

3179. Take both scales and look at the salaries: you will see, on comparing teachers of the smaller-sized schools with those of the larger schools, that one teacher may receive four times as much salary as another?—Yes.

3180. Now, do you think it is possible for one teacher to do four times the work of another?—Then you come to the question of equal pay for equal work; we must estimate the value of that work according to the district. In some cases one might do ten times more work than another. You cannot estimate the value of a man's work in the way you put it to me.

3181. Then, a teacher in a school of about 20 or 30 pupils is doing only one-fourth of the work done by a headmaster in a city school: is that so?—You cannot estimate the worth of a man's work in a large city school; but it can be safely said that a headmaster in a large city school does more than four times the work of a sole teacher in the smaller country schools.

3182. Is that headmaster's work more laborious than the work of the sole teacher in the country school, who has to take charge of his older scholars, and also the infants?—Yes, taking into account the worry, responsibility, &c.

3183. You are aware that the headmaster of a large school has assistants to help him?—Yes, but he is responsible for the whole.

3184. Do you think that the master in town, who has the assistance of a well-educated staff, and who has simply to supervise and control, is doing four times the work of the sole teacher in the country?—Undoubtedly I do; but I think we ought to have a fixed salary for the smaller country schools. The man in charge of big schools has a greater responsibility on his shoulders.

3185. What do you think should be a fair minimum salary for a teacher in the smaller country schools?—I should not give less than £100.

3186. Do you think there should be a maximum for a headmaster of the town schools?—I see no objection.

3187. What should be the maximum?—Well, we have already the fact brought out that four teachers are getting £400. I do not think that is any too much. The responsibility they bear is a very great consideration.

3188. What I want to know is whether you think it is fair that a teacher in an isolated position—a man fully qualified—should receive only one-fourth of the salary paid to the master in the city?—Well, the only thing to do is to put that man into the position where a better salary is paid. I would not lower the city teacher's salary because another man was getting less.

3189. But if you wish to promote the comfort of the teaching profession generally, do you think it advisable that there should be so great a difference between the salaries?—Unless there is a salary of, say, £400 to aim for, you will not get the better class of teachers to do the work. Good men would not enter the service unless there were some decent salaries offering.

3190. Do you think that a high salary attracts more men than the low salaries repel?—We want the salary that attracts; never mind the question of repelling.

3191. If comfort and prosperity and contentment are the results of the amount of money paid in salaries there should be a wider difference between the salaries paid than exists now?—I have not stated that. You must remember that there are grades by which a man steps upward in the profession, and no man obtains a salary of £400 but by passing through those grades.

3192. I do not suggest any disturbance of the grades, but I point this out: that it is quite possible for a man holding the highest certificate to be placed in a worse position in a country school than the teacher with an inferior qualification in a large school?—There is no such case in our district.

3193. But there is the possibility?—If such a qualified man came to us we would snap him up at once.

3194. I want to know whether you think that an improvement might not be effected by fixing a maximum of such a character as would enable the teachers in the smaller schools in the country to get a much better salary than they do at present?—I must say No. I do not see how it can be done by fixing a maximum salary of such a character.

3195. But could not the present system be improved by lessening the great disparity between these salaries?—No, I do not see that it could be done. The smaller salaries would not gain much by reducing the larger ones.

H. B. Kirk, M.A., Assistant Inspector of Native Schools and Chief Clerk in the Inspector-General's Branch of the Department, examined.

Mr. Kirk: I have no written statement, although I should like to have prepared one, but excessive pressure of urgent work has prevented my doing so. I have the permission of the Inspector-General to state the result, so far as I am concerned, of my observations regarding the system of issuing certificates at present in force. I should like to speak as to what I believe to be the strongest point of the present system, not making any secret of the fact that none of us

consider it a perfect system. Its strongest point is, perhaps, that it has induced a large number of teachers to take a university course, and has placed at the disposal of the Boards a much more considerable number of teachers of culture and of high attainments than they could otherwise have had. I do not say that the existence of the scheme alone, without the co-operation of the Boards, would have resulted as it has done with that co-operation. I have figures here which will show that the Boards have co-operated, and have appreciated one strong point of this scheme. Another piece of evidence which cannot be set forth in figures is the manifest anxiety of teachers, as appearing in correspondence with the department, to obtain promotion. Teachers passing some examination not recognised by the department always show the utmost anxiety to prove their case and to secure a higher certificate. Up to the present time the New Zealand University has granted 681 degrees in the faculties of arts and science—the two faculties of most importance to the teacher. Of the 681 graduates, 303, or 44·4 per cent., have been classified by the department. This is without taking any account of a very large number of graduates who have applied for classification, but who have not been classified, not having had the requisite experience, or who, being women, married and did not push their applications to the point of completion. The classification incidentally makes provision for high schools, but that, I take it, is a matter on which I need not say anything. There is one other point I should like to refer to. It has, I believe, been stated in evidence that the method providing for the expression of an Inspector's judgment as to a teacher's efficiency by assigning marks is as clumsy and unsuitable an one as could be devised. There is nothing in the observation of the working of the scheme that gives any support to such a statement. No Inspector has said that he desired a change in this respect, nor have any representations been made to the effect that there exists an Inspector in whose mind the quantity 2 does not bear a more constant relation to the quantity 10 than, say, the word "tolerable" bears to the word "excellent." If I may go back to the subject of appreciation by the Boards of the present scheme, I should like to submit not whole columns of figures, but the results of them to you. They show that in 1886 there were 1,302 classified teachers in the colony, and of that number 769 teachers (or 59·06 per cent. of the classified teachers) were in Class E. At the present time there are 2,622 classified teachers, of which number 981 (or 37·41 per cent.) are in Class E. Class D shows a very satisfactory increase from 29·41 per cent. to 51·25 per cent. The higher classes, except Class C, which constitutes often a resting stage for Class B, also show a constant increase up to the present time. It may be of interest if I place before you a table showing the average number of children intrusted to teachers of each class in Division 1. It shows generally that, efficiency and other things being equal, preference is given to teachers having good literary attainment, although many large schools are still properly held by the experienced and efficient men of lower-class certificates that have held them for years. I have also some figures showing the average length of service in each district that gains promotion: they show the average in each district for each division, and a mean for the colony. [Exhibit 106.] I should like to make it clear that I, no more than any one else, consider this a perfect system, but I think it would be a great pity if a system that has undoubtedly done good work should now be needlessly interfered with.

3196. *Mr. Stewart.*] I would like you to be good enough to tell us what course is followed in allowing the matriculation examination to count for a partial D?—The University places in the hands of the Inspector-General, for confidential use, the marks gained at the matriculation examination. These are compared with the Class D marks, and an estimate is arrived at as to what marks at the matriculation examination should be accepted for Class D. If a candidate has in six stated subjects gained such marks as come up to that estimate he receives exemption in those six subjects.

3197. Have there been many promotions under the head "Further consideration"?—Not for three and, I think, not for five years. It is several years since more than one promotion has been made under that head.

3198. Do you not think that the time has come for the abolition of such a provision?—I do not. Teachers occasionally arrive in the colony not fully equipped with the documents that show their standing at Home.

3199. *Mr. Luke.*] Do I understand you to say that the present system of classification answers very well?—It has answered well in the past.

3200. Do you think that a better scheme could be devised?—It is certainly possible that this might be done.

3201. Could it not be simplified a great deal?—I think the scheme is capable of simplification without sacrificing any point in which it has been advantageous.

3202. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Would you favour the reduction of a teacher's certificate when he became less efficient?—No, I should not. I may say that the Inspectors from year to year record in the books of the department their opinions of the teachers' decreasing efficiency, but those marks are not divulged.

3203. Do you favour a bonus being granted on a certificate?—Yes; or any other step that will foster a teacher's increasing efficiency.

3204. Would you favour as large a bonus as is given by the Wanganui Board?—I have not considered the question sufficiently to be able to give an opinion.

3205. With reference to Class A certificate, do you think that should be restricted to those students who pass the honours examination at the time specified by the University?—That certificate is now issued to teachers who at the honours examination, without limitation as to time, gain marks that would give second or third honours at the time fixed by the University.

3206. You consider that there are too many classes from E to A?—I am inclined to think so. I think we are reaching a point now at which we might consider the question of discontinuing the issue of Class E certificates.

3207. *Mr. Hill.*] Did I understand you to say that you consider the present a most perfect system of classification?—No.

3208. You think it can be improved?—Undoubtedly.

3209. Is not the tendency in all large goverments, where there is centralisation, to think that everything they adopt is most perfect?—I have not sufficient knowledge of large central governments to answer that.

3210. Do you think a certificate should be allowed to a candidate because he simply is a graduate?—I do not.

3211. Have graduates who have never been trained as teachers and have never been examined in the requirements of the department been certificated by the department?—Graduates who have not been trained, but who have had the requisite teaching experience, have been classified, as other teachers have been.

3212. Do you think that two years is sufficient to guarantee that a man is capable of managing a large school?—The certificate does not set forth that he is capable of doing so.

3213. You are aware of the plan of granting certificates in the Old Country?—Yes.

3214. Do you think that a man with a degree should be allowed to be classified by the department unless he passes in the subjects required to classify?—I do not.

3215. You think that the present system ought to be improved in this respect?—Yes; I should be in favour of insisting that graduates should not, as at present, be exempt from music, drawing, school-management, and, in the case of women, needlework.

3216. Why should he be exempt from writing?—I would add writing and reading. I should not be willing to give a certificate to a graduate simply because he is a graduate.

3217. Would you insist on his taking geography and history?—I would not insist on his taking geography and history. I think every graduate who has properly taken his degree has such mental capacity that he can approach such subjects and grapple readily with them.

3218. But other teachers can do that equally well?—I do not admit that, except in the case of individuals.

3219. We have it stated by a witness that he has known a graduate who did not understand the elements of arithmetic?—There may be such men, but I have not met one.

3220. Then, if there may be such men, should not graduates be required to take these subjects?—When I say there may be such men, I merely wish to avoid rudely discrediting the statement of a former witness, and to avoid any implication of a right to limit the belief of other men. For my own part, however, I do not find myself possessed of such a stock of credulity as to enable me to accept the statement.

3221. Do you think that a candidate, even under the conditions you have named, should be allowed to be classed without taking all the subjects which the department sets down for the D examination?—I am not at all in favour of sending a man back again to do work he has already done.

3222. You know that candidates have made application to the department to be exempt from certain subjects in the examination on account of matriculation work?—Yes, that is so.

3223. And have been permitted to be so exempt?—Yes.

3224. Do you think it is a wise course to adopt?—Yes, undoubtedly I do. I do not mean to imply that I think they deserve all the recognition that is given. The recognition is, in my opinion, excessive, even given in the guarded way in which it is now given.

3225. Do you not think that some change is necessary in the matter?—For some years it has been thought that a change is desirable.

3226. *Mr. Weston.*] You told us that in your books were noted the shortcomings of teachers?—There is a record of the decreasing efficiency of teachers.

3227. You said that it is a private book?—It is a confidential record of the Education Department.

3228. You would object to any one but just the immediate officers seeing it?—I did not say that, but every officer would strongly object to any person outside the office seeing it.

3229. What is the object of keeping the book?—It purports to be a record of the history and service of each classified teacher. It records promotion.

3230. Who is to benefit by the record, favourable or not, to the teacher?—Nobody is to be benefited by it, except that it forms the basis upon which the teachers' promotion is given from one grade to another.

3231. If it be necessary to keep that record, should not the Education Boards, who have the appointment of teachers, have an opportunity of seeing those records?—It seems to me they should not.

3232. Then, what is the use of the book?—It enables the status of teachers to be determined, and shows how the classification is arrived at.

3233. But if a man's certificate is to guide the Board of Education in dealing with applications for employment, should not a Board have what you possess to guide its decision?—There is no need to do that so long as the Inspector is an officer of the Board.

3234. If the Inspectors have this information and can supply it to the Boards, why is it necessary that you should so jealously guard these records?—The record must be continued for the purposes of classification. The Inspectors have confidence in stating their judgement to us, knowing that we receive it in confidence. We also owe a duty of confidence to the teachers.

3235. *Mr. Hogben.*] The position might be made a little clearer, That book contains not only the records of cases where the Inspectors' marks are lower, but it also contains the records of marks raised?—Yes.

3236. And where there are marks for length of service, &c., entitling the teacher to promotion he gets promotion?—That is so.

3237. That is to say, the figure of the certificate is raised?—Yes.

3238. It is necessary to keep that book from year to year in order to see that the teacher is entitled to a raising of the certificate?—Yes.

3239. And when the figure of a certificate is raised that fact is published in the *Gazette*?—Yes.

3240. Available for the use of the public?—Yes.

3241. So that this book contains records of teachers' careers, which records are practically tabulated from time to time for the information of the public?—Yes.

3242. That is, with the exception of a few cases where an Inspector has expressed his opinion that the teacher's efficiency has decreased?—Yes.

3243. When an Inspector's marks are sent to the department in reference to the teachers it would seem to be rather extraordinary to leave out of the record-book those cases in which he thought the teacher was not worthy of the high marks given previously?—Yes.

3244. In such cases it is possible circumstances might arise in which that information would be most useful to the department?—Yes.

3245. It is available to the Inspector-General almost in the same manner in which that information is available through the Inspector to the Board?—Just so.

3246. There might be some cases in which in a teacher's own interest it would be advisable to have such a record kept somewhere in the colony?—Yes.

3247. *Mr. Davidson.*] You are in favour of holding out inducement to teachers to raise their literary status as high as possible?—Yes.

3248. Are you in favour of any special consideration of allowance being made for teachers in remote districts?—I am not in favour of teachers in isolated parts being treated in this respect more favourably than any others, hard as their lot is. The certificate should mean the same thing for every one that holds it.

3249. You admit that while a teacher is doing his daily work his spare time is limited?—Yes; but I think the value of passing an examination, one subject in each year, is not very great.

3250. Do you not think that a man would be as complete a master of a subject by taking one subject at a time and doing that thoroughly?—I do not think any one is master of a subject studying it for one or for many years.

3251. But he can take an examination year by year?—On that point I state only my personal opinion, seeing that I differ from the Inspector-General. I do not think it would be advantageous to split up an examination to let a candidate take one subject each year.

3252. *Mr. Stewart.*] Is it recognised by the department that an Inspector may give lower marks to a teacher at the end of six or eight years than at the end of four years?—Yes. The lower mark does not take effect upon the teacher's classificatiou, although it is recorded.

3253. *Mr. Hill.*] So far as classification is concerned you do not take into consideration the lower mark?—No.

3254. *The Chairman.*] Is any particular name given to this book?—The Register of Teachers' Classification.

3255. In whose custody is it kept?—It is in the custody of the Inspector-General. He intrusts it to the care of such an official as he has confidence in.

3256. Besides that official, who has access to it?—No one but the officials concerned in that part of the work of the Inspector-General's branch of the department.

3257. Have the Inspectors access to the book?—No. The question is never raised, but I do not think we should keep the information from an Inspector should he desire it.

3258. Teachers who are affected by the marks in that book, have they any opportunity of examining it?—No.

3259. Do you think such absolute secrecy is really necessary or desirable?—I think that, so long as marks for increasing efficiency only take effect in the classification, such secrecy is absolutely incumbent on the department. I do not think the department would be right in making public any lower mark that takes no effect on a teacher's certificate.

3260. Is it not possible that a teacher would not be making such progress as he expects, and not know the cause?—No, I hardly think so. If he studies the regulations on the point, and knows his length of service, he can ascertain what marks the Inspector has given him.

3261. We have heard the opinion expressed that there should be some power to punish teachers if necessary by reducing their certificates: is it advisable that such power should be exercised?—I should be very sorry to see it done. It would be wrong to punish a man for what is not his own fault—advancing age, for instance.

3262. His certificate should be unassailable?—It should express the high-water mark of his efficiency. It would be a very invidious task, in a district where there is only one Inspector, to record on a teacher's certificate a fact that would interfere with his prospects for the rest of his life.

ROBERT LEE, Chief Inspector of Schools, examined.

Mr. Lee: I may say that I am quite in sympathy with the proposal on the part of the Government to launch a colonial scale of salaries. I take it as an honest and well-thought-out effort to do justice to underpaid teachers, and it will ease the Boards when they come to use it. I think possibly it will lead up to what I should like to see—that is, a better recognition all round of the position of the teachers in the community. I think, myself, that the teaching profession is underpaid. It should be recognised by the community that the work of education is one of the most useful and one of the most honourable avocations that a man can put his hands to, and the service should be adequately paid. As an officer of a large district, which for the most part has been paying its teachers on a more liberal scale than most other districts of the colony, I must say that I feel that in this scale there is a little levelling-down; and, as teachers generally are underpaid, there ought to be a little levelling-up. So far as the scale affects us in this district, the teachers of the medium schools will receive less salary than they do at present, whilst in other cases there are increases. I do not know that there is a single teacher in my district who is over-

paid; therefore I would not like any scale introduced that would lower the salaries of teachers with schools of 50 to 100 in average attendance. As to the working-out of the scale, I think the payment by strict average is very trying, especially in regard to the teachers' sense of honesty. There are days in the year when the weather is so extremly inclement as to make it almost impossible to travel, and children cannot possibly attend school. It does seem hard that in such cases the average for the week should be entirely spoiled by one inclement day. I would therefore suggest, as a means of raising salaries, that, instead of the strict average (for purposes of calculating salaries), four-fifths of the best attendances should be taken, allowing one day in the week for exceptionally bad weather. Some allowance should certainly be made for small attendances on bad days. The question of house-rent, which is a big factor with us in the city, does not appear in the calculations of the plan submitted for our consideration. The staffing-allowance is a very fair and reasonable one.

3263. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you noticed that in calculating the salaries in the new scheme the increase is to take place by units?—Yes.

3264. What is your opinion of that?—I think it very doubtful whether it is desirable.

3265. In the Wellington District there are nine schools with an average attendance between 30 and 35?—I should like to say, with regard to our own scale, that we have departed from it a good deal. If I had my own way as an official we should have no such departures. The scale has been modified, and is lower now than it used to be.

3266. You notice that in those nine schools the salary is £155?—Yes.

3267. Suppose that a school average of 30 should drop one unit, the head-teacher would lose £55 a year?—Yes.

3268. Would it not be a temptation to falsify his rolls under such a method?—I am quite aware that in any scheme there will be small discrepancies. I am sorry the difference is so much as it is here. The temptation is there, certainly.

3269. Do you not think that members of the Board would hesitate before inflicting such a hardship on a man because of the drop of one unit?—I do not think they should, for if we have a rule we must carry it into effect.

3270. In Otago a good deal of hardship has resulted from the same cause—schools of 21 and 35 carried a salary of £140 a year, and when the attendance dropped to 31 the master would lose £40 a year?—That is so.

3271. That has been a source of worry to the Otago Education Board?—Yes.

3272. Do you think it would be wise, if this Commission were drawing up a scale, to take the increase by units?—I do not like such a large discrepancy.

3273. Do you not think it better that a man should know that by such a small drop in the average he would lose a much less sum off his salary?—A small increment might be better.

3274. In your opinion, the teachers in the country districts of Wellington are very much underpaid?—I think that teachers as a whole are underpaid. I know that men who started in life with me—and I am supposed to have done well—have gone into other work and have done better. The schoolmaster's life may be an easy one in some respects; he does not have the worry of a man in business for himself; but many business-men make as much in five years as a schoolmaster can save in the whole of his life.

3275. In England, Scotland, and other countries the tendency is to raise the maximum salaries paid to teachers: is that not so?—Yes.

3276. Have you noticed that in London a fair percentage of the schools carry a maximum salary of over £500?—Yes.

3277. Do you think it is in the interests of education that prizes should be offered for those in the teaching profession to advance themselves?—Certainly.

3278. In some of the largest mining claims in Australia the mining manager is paid as much as £1,400 a year?—I am not surprised to hear it.

3279. The man who is doing the laborious work in the drive gets £3 a week?—Yes.

3280. Are you of opinion that it is best to pay well for brains?—You must.

3281. On the whole, you approve of the staffing conditions of the scale?—I think they are very fair.

3282. In our schools of over 500 (mixed schools), where the attendance in the Fourth Standard is from 60, do you consider that the average woman is physically capable of taking such a class?—No.

3283. There are exceptional women who might do it?—Yes.

3284. Do you suggest any provision whereby such exceptional women might take such work?—I should be afraid of any such provision being pushed too far. There could be no objection to making provision to meet exceptional cases, but on the whole it is not desirable.

3285. *Mr. Stewart.*] You are in sympathy with the adoption of a colonial scale?—Yes. I am pleased that an effort is being made to put things in systematic order generally. I have felt keenly the want of somebody who would take up good recommendations and utilise them for the advancement of education. A proposal to establish cadets on certain lines in connection with New Zealand schools has been set aside as not worth taking up. This want of systematic order is a matter I should like to see threshed out by experts and educationists, and when something like this is done we shall advance. Under the present conditions there is no arterial system of education in the colony, and I hail this scheme of the Inspector-General's as a beginning.

3286. I infer from your answer that education and the carrying-on of it is a matter for experts?—Certainly.

3287. It has been objected that a colonial scale will minimise the influence of the Boards' control: is there anything much in such an objection?—The adoption of such a scale will relieve the Boards of a great deal of anxiety.

3288. Am I to understand that you are of opinion that a colonial scale of salary would be productive of a system of sound finance in the colony?—Yes. There was a time in the history of our Board when we were always solvent.

3289. It is suggested that, instead of a colonial scale, we should have a differential capitation: would that be a cure for existing anomalies?—I cannot give any opinion on that question.

3290. What do you consider should be the minimum salary for, say, a junior certificated assistant in large or middle-sized schools?—I do not take that as a matter of any great moment, because sometimes the junior certificated teacher is an ex-pupil-teacher, and gets a fair salary. We have been giving about £80 or £90. I think £100 would not be too much.

3291. In those grades would you pay equal salaries to both sexes?—Yes, up to a certain point.

3292. What do you think should be the prize for those entering the profession to look forward to?—Well, do you think it is necessary to have any limit?

3293. We are bound to have some limit?—I do not think it serves any purpose to fix a limit.

3294. Do you think that a salary of £400 a year would be too much as a maximum?—Certainly not.

3295. Would you go a little higher?—Yes.

3296. It has been insinuated that the headmasters of some of your city schools are getting quite enough, if not too much: do you consider that such is the case?—No.

3297. Do you think they are underpaid?—Yes.

3298. It would be better for the profession if higher salaries were paid?—Yes. There is not sufficient inducement: there are no prizes. In the year 1850 I was one of four pupils, three of whom lived to receive a salary of over £1,000 a year. I do not get anything like that.

3299. Yet you have reached the top of the profession in Wellington?—Yes.

3300. With regard to the payment of women teachers in this district, do you think they are adequately paid?—Well, they are more adequately paid than men, but they are not adequately paid. I think all salaries for schools of 60 or 70 children and over are underpaid. You must pay men well if there is to be anything worth the name of education.

3301. Do you recognise that for the position of headmaster of a large school you want administrative capacity as well as teaching ability?—Certainly.

3302. Is that administrative capacity very common? Ought we really to pay for this administrative capacity when we get it?—It is a great deal of what we pay for.

3303. The secretary of your Board, in giving evidence yesterday, said that appointments were more often made without the Inspectors being consulted than with: do you think that in making appointments Inspectors should be consulted?—Yes; I am very pronounced on that point. Of late years there has been a disposition on the part of my Board to take things more into their own hands. Now, for the most part, the Chairman looks over the credentials of the applicants, and the Board follows his direction. Occasionally, when it suits, one's advice is asked for.

3304. Then, sufficient consideration is not given in this district to the opinions of the Inspector in regard to making appointments?—That is so. We are suffering now from the effects of a haphazard system of selection of pupil-teachers.

3305. And you will go on suffering from that for some time?—Yes; it is one thing to put a man into a post, but quite another to remove him from it. The mistake is in making a bad appointment. This is a source of great trouble to the Inspectors: we have to find fault simply because the material is bad in so many cases.

3306. We may take it from your evidence that the interests of children in the Wellington Education District have suffered because expert advice has not been taken?—Yes.

3307. To some extent that has been set right in the City of Wellington?—Yes.

3308. Do you think that the present arrangement has sufficiently safeguarded the interests of education in the selection of pupil-teachers?—I hope so.

3309. Do you think there should be an entrance examination before pupil-teachers should be employed?—Yes.

3310. In your report you state that the number of small schools is on the increase: supposing there is an application for the establishment of a school, are the Inspectors consulted as to whether that school is necessary or not?—Yes.

3311. It has been suggested that the present method of taking a working-average is practically inoperative?—I made a suggestion in my opening remarks for altering the present method. We assume that teachers are honest, and would not make out a return for more days than they are entitled to.

3312. Has your Board taken into consideration the differences in the cost of living in various parts of the district in its salary scale?—No.

3313. Do you think it practicable or advisable that this Commission should take such into consideration in drawing up its scale?—There might be something in it, but it would be a difficult matter to determine. Teachers who are relegated to the remote parts of the country will get their living cheaper than those who have a better life in town.

3314. *Mr. Luke.*] Up to a certain point you believe in equal payment for men and women?—Yes.

3315. It would not be in the interests of education that they should get equal payment?—No.

3316. Has the working of the Technical School here been successful?—Yes; I think our Education Board has honestly intended to benefit the cause of education in establishing the school. It has been of great service to the colony; but at the same time the Technical School cannot run on its own wheels, and that is a great pity, but probably it will yet be made a self-supporting institution.

3317. Do schools in the outlying districts (aided schools) get the capitation grant?—They receive the full capitation grant, and are otherwise assisted. They are also visited by the Inspectors.

3318. What is your opinion as to the necessity of a training-college in a district like Wellington: do you think the Victoria University College could be utilised?—I should hardly think the Victoria College would train teachers. I think the time has come when the pupil-teacher system should be modified. Pupil-teachers should be relieved from their actual teaching during the day; perhaps a double set of pupil-teachers could be arranged for, so that they could teach half-time and have the other half for study. One or, at most, two training-colleges ought to do for the whole colony. The training system has never yet been put on a satisfactory footing.

3319. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Supposing there were a chair of pedagogy in connection with the Victoria College, nevertheless the want of a training-college would still be felt?—Yes; it would make no difference.

3320. If the Wellington Board gives way and modifies its scale of salaries in particular instances, pressure, I suppose, is brought to bear on them in numerous instances?—I have already said we are not keeping to scale.

3321. If you do not keep to the scale you will land in "Queer Street"?—Perhaps.

3322. Do you favour a system of bonus on certificate?—No.

3323. Should an alternative be given to teachers in the country schools regarding which class-subjects they should prepare children in?—We have found no difficulty in keeping to our programme. We have an alternative system for science.

3324. You would not advocate the penalising of teachers who do not hold the requisite minimum certificate?—I think any one must hold a qualification to take charge of a school. If he is a capable teacher for a school he ought to be paid salary accordingly, whether he holds an E, D, or C certificate.

3325. Do you not find that when a good position is advertised a very large number of teachers holding low certificates apply on the chance of getting in?—They may apply, but they do not often get the appointment. With our Board the high certificate generally gets the appointment, and rightly so.

3326. Is preference given by your Board to females as teachers and pupil-teachers in making appointments?—I do not think so.

3327. Not for economic reasons?—No.

3328. In the suggested scale are the salaries for pupil-teachers ample?—They are fair; but I always recognise that pupil-teachers are getting an education. Let them have moderate pay, plenty of time for study, a good education, and a fair opportunity of obtaining an appointment when their apprenticeship is over. The pupil-teachers' examinations might be done away with. The Standard VII. examination might do for entrance, matriculation the half-way house, and the E examination for the end. As things are at present, there is a good deal of overlapping in regard to examinations.

3329. Do you think that the headmasters of schools in which pupil-teachers are engaged should receive remuneration for the instruction given to pupil-teachers?—We have always paid teachers so-much a year for such instruction in the country schools. In the town we have brought the pupil-teachers into classes taught by the first assistants in the city schools, who get something extra for it. This works fairly well.

3330. As to truancy, do you think the compulsory number of attendances should be increased from six, say, to eight per week?—Yes.

3331. Are you in favour of increasing the mileage?—I do not see the necessity. In the country the children often use short-cuts in going to and from school.

3332. Have you considered the question of retiring-allowance for teachers grown old in the service?—Some such allowance is most desirable. The absence of it is one of the drawbacks to the service. We want the Government to come down with a sum so as to give a start in this matter.

3333. Would the adoption of a colonial scale tend to lead the Government to give a grant towards this?—Yes.

3334. *Mr. Hill.*] You are the senior Inspector in Wellington, are you not?—Yes.

3335. You have seen all the changes as the outcome of the Education Act of 1877?—Yes.

3336. And now you believe that a colonial scale of salaries will be beneficial in the interests of teachers?—Yes; provided, as I say, that you level up the present rate of pay in the Wellington District.

3337. You said that at least £400 is not too much for a man in a large school?—No, it is not too much.

3338. What size school would you suggest for a salary of £400?—I am not disposed to fix any limit. I do not see any object to be gained by it.

3339. If to pay such large salaries you would have to lower the salaries of teachers of the smaller class of schools, would you agree to that?—No.

3340. It is necessary to give ample salaries in the smaller schools?—Yes, a fair salary.

3341. Are the salaries in the proposed scale sufficient?—Yes, fairly sufficient, for the smaller class of schools.

3342. Is the staffing in this scale as generous as it is in your district?—I think so. I think, the stronger the members of the staff the less staff we can do with.

3343. In the staffing as proposed, would you give any option to the Board to modify the staff so long as the amount of money was expended on that staff?—It would be necessary to give some discretion to a Board for certain reasons.

3344. On the recommendation of an Inspector would you modify a staff?—Yes; where the exigencies of the case required it.

3345. Would you still give Committees the right or some voice in the selection of teachers?—I have no pronounced opinion about that. There is not much to complain of as things operate with us.

3346. Do you find that Committees take much interest in the selection and appointing of teachers?—It varies very much. Sometimes no interest is taken, and at others the interest is very keen.

3347. Would it be advisable that Boards should have the sole power of making the appointments?—I have not given that subject much thought.

3348. Assuming that the Boards retain the right of making the appointments, would you suggest that they should also have the right to remove a teacher from one district to another if recommended by the Inspector?—Yes, I think so. It is necessary in order to adjust matters sometimes.

3349. Do you think that the sexes should be separated, or that the boys and girls should be taught in the same class?—In all small schools they must be in the same class. In schools where there are 80 or 100 children in a standard they are just as well separated.

3350. Would you suggest that a school should not be allowed to grow beyond, say, 700 children; would you limit the number?—No.

3351. *Mr. Smith.*] What is the smallest number of pupils for which your Board would grant an aided school?—There is no limit.

3352. *Mr. Weston.*] If you separate the sexes would you not require a greater number of teachers?—If I made a recommendation to separate them it would not be a hard-and-fast rule. I would leave it in the hands of the head-teacher.

3353. You referred to a cadet system to show that more elasticity should be given to the authorities in administering the education system?—You put the thing in a different form, but I think we mean about the same. If we had a Council of Education it would, I think, be a good thing in the interests of education generally. The Council could be advised by the department and by the Inspector-General, and could take up suggestions and make direct representations to Parliament. Then we might, for instance, get a good cadet system. As things are now, much depends on the caprices of the Boards as to whether they took useful suggestions up or dropped them.

3354. Does not all that go to advocate central administration of the present scheme?—Yes.

3355. You are favourable to that?—Yes. We need something to push education on, and thus make real progress.

3356. Do you think the colony would approve of a central system of administration?—I cannot say. That is not in my province.

3357. In regard to the present system of primary education, do you consider it is likely to create a dead uniformity in the teaching of the children throughout the colony?—No. So long as men are men, we shall all differ.

3358. You do not think that the fact of having the same reading-books and the same methods, and so on, will produce that unformity?—No. In any system of education there must be method; hence the standards. As long as the same ground is travelled over, and the same system pervades, there will be a similarity of work; but so long as men are different in their minds and methods there will be differences.

3359. Should the Boards dismiss sentiment and dispense with teachers when they think them beyond their duties?—There comes a time when every man must retire.

3360. Do you think this Commission should initiate a superannuation fund, and compel teachers to subscribe to it?—I think that would be a good thing.

3361. *The Chairman.*] What do you think should be the minimum salary for a country teacher, irrespective of the size of the school?—Not less than £100 a year. I do not advocate limiting salaries, either up or down. It is a difficult question to answer fairly.

3362. Do you think there should be a fixed salary according to the size of the school?—Yes.

3363. If you have no particular limit, how are you going to fix a scale?—Well, we have never given less than £120 to certificated teachers in the smaller schools.

3364. Would that be a reasonable minimum now?—Yes.

3365. What would be a fair maximum?—There is an immense difference in the two things. I could not say.

3366. Do you think the salary should increase with age?—The master must show his ability to rise to the position.

3367. Then, when he becomes old and somewhat deficient in efficiency, you think his salary should decline?—No. As long as he can fulfil his post he should be paid accordingly.

3368. Seeing that the great majority of our teachers in this district, and in New Zealand generally, are only in charge of schools with a limited average (100 and under), do you think it desirable to reduce large salaries to make up the underpaid ones?—I do not agree with that principle. It would be taking away from old servants to give to young teachers.

3369. But do you not believe in the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number?—No.

3370. You are opposed to sacrifices of that nature?—Yes; I like to see the good fall where it is deserved.

3371. There are considerable differences in the amounts paid to the sexes?—Yes.

3372. Is the disparity too great?—It admits of being adjusted. In some cases it is too great. I think, on the whole, that the better work is done by the men, and they should be better paid. In the event of any adjustment it would be a great pity if any teacher now receiving a certain salary should have that salary reduced at all.

3373. On the whole, are the differences between the salaries of men and women fair and reasonable?—Yes, on the whole.

3374. And, on the whole, the difference between the salaries for the smaller schools in the country and those for the larger schools in the city are fair and reasonable?—Yes.

3375. Is there necessity for reducing those differences?—No.

3376. But to raise the lower salaries would it be advisable to reduce the higher?—Any such reduction would have a very deadening effect on the educational system.

3377. But I would like to equalise things a little more?—I do not believe in such equalisation as that.

3378. Are the schools in this district at the present time sufficiently staffed?—Yes, fairly so.

3379. Are the teachers generally competent men?—I think we have in the service a number of headmasters who are as good as can be found. At the same time, as I have already said, the system of making appointments does not reach the best available material.

3380. Do you think the appointments made by the Board during the last year or two will compare with those previously made?—It is rather invidious for me to say. I am in the invidious position of saying things a little disparaging to my own Board.

3381. If the statement is made by an officer of this Board that the appointments made are the best possible, is that correct?—In my opinion, it is not correct.

3382. Then, you say that the members of this Board fail to select the best teachers from their list of applicants?—I have said face to face to the Board that the Board is not making the best appointments.

3383. Seeing that we receive a very large number of applications from outside districts, what can the Wellington Inspector possibly know, who confines his inspection to the town, and does not go into the country?—I should be out of place in discussing that matter.

3384. When a serious imputation against the Board is lodged its character should be vindicated?—I have said to you what I have said to the Board face to face, and I must decline to go further into this discussion.

[Omitted from Mr. Hogben's Dunedin Evidence.]

THURSDAY, 16TH MAY, 1901.

STATEMENT by Mr. HOGBEN on submitting his Suggested Alternative Scheme for Schools with 15 to 330 in average attendance, dated 15th May, 1901.

Mr. Hogben: The amount on which the scale is to be based being limited to £4 capitation on the average attendance for the colony—that amount to provide for teachers' salaries and other necessary purposes—the question arises as to how much shall be devoted to the improving of the staffing of the schools of the colony, and how much shall be devoted to the raising of salaries where they are below what we may justly regard as fair remuneration for services rendered. In my former evidence, I said I should like to see as good staffing as I then suggested. At the same time, that staffing means the cutting down of a larger number of salaries than I should like to see cut down, and the proposed scale that I put before you this morning gives a somewhat less generous staff to the schools than what I originally proposed; but the staffing, I think, is as good as any in New Zealand or the Australian Colonies —better than most of them—yet it does not practically bring down any salaries at all. In introducing the first proposed scale I hope that I conveyed the idea to the Commission that it was a suggestion. I take the full responsibility for making that suggestion, and I wish there were money to carry it out on the higher salaries in certain grades. But I regard it myself as a suggestion. It has not the sanction of the Minister or the Government, but I put it out as a well considered suggestion. At the same time, if we do not give quite so generous a staffing, the salaries will be higher, and it seems to me I shall save time in districts like this, where the pinch would be greatest, if I can show another possible alternative. I have taken the trouble during the last two evenings to work this new scale out to see if it could be done with the £4 capitation. On the printed paper I now put in [Exhibit 50] the only salaries that are dealt with are those of the head or sole teacher, and of the infant mistress. I find that by postponing the appointment of the first assistant until the school reaches an average of 40, and postponing the appointment of the second assistant teacher until the school reaches an average of 150, there is saved altogether £12,740. The increase in salaries is £8,335; so that there is a net saving of £4,405. That is to say, this scheme costs £4,405 less than the other, with a substantial increase in salaries. These salaries, taking the Otago District, are as high, with the exception of one place which is £1 lower, as any salaries that the corresponding officers now receive, and I do not think it is paying them too much to pay them such salaries. This £4,405 will be available, therefore, for raising the salaries of assistants other than the infant mistress. I may be prepared to-morrow to say how much it will be possible to raise these.

FRIDAY, 17th MAY, 1901.

G. HOGBEN, Inspector-General of Schools, examined.

Mr. Hogben: Last night I tried to find how far the £4,405 would go in bringing up the salaries of assistants to the Otago scale, which is the highest scale in the colony, with the exception of about three instances in other districts (I think they are the only instances in which the salaries are higher than in Otago). To bring all the salaries up to the Otago scale you would require throughout the colony £5,335 in addition to what is required by the original scale. We had £4,405 to spare in consequence of the alternative scheme presented yesterday, so that £930 would be required to bring up all the salaries to the Otago scale. It comes to about 2d. over £4 a head. If we left out the first male assistants in schools of 200 to 250, of which there are twenty-seven in

the colony, or omitting also the district high schools—only twenty-one or twenty-two—it only requires £3,715, so that if we bring them half way between my present proposed scale and the Otago scale it could all be done for a little less than £4 per head. But when we get so near as £900 to the total money available, I think we need not bring them down at all. Every head-teacher, every mistress, and every other teacher, with the exception of three or four assistants, in the whole colony can be brought up to the Otago scale, and as for the salaries of those three or four I think they would be recognised as anomalous. That would practically bring all the teachers (except some head-teachers in the Wellington district) up to the Otago scale, or up to the Canterbury scale where it is higher than the Otago scale. It practically means levelling-up almost everywhere, and levelling down hardly anywhere, with an improvement of the staff.

The Chairman.] The Otago scale is the highest in New Zealand?—Yes, with the exception of some head-teachers in Wellington, and one or two instances in North Canterbury.

And nearly all teachers' salaries throughout New Zealand can be brought up to the Otago scale, provided that this £4 capitation is maintained?—Yes, and an increased allowance to Boards besides for incidental expenses. I should be glad to see wiped out also all reductions for certificates.

Mr. Weston.] Will this alteration enable the Government to supply the Boards with funds to pay their overdrafts? Wellington has one and Canterbury has one?—That is a matter that must be taken account of, but it ought not to disturb the permanent arrangement—viz., the establishment of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries.

SATURDAY 29TH JUNE, 1901.

G. HOGBEN, Secretary for Education, recalled.

Mr. Hogben: I have here printed copies of the second alternative scale, C, the original of which I handed in on Thursday last, and I think it will facilitate the work of the Commission if I point out the differences between this and the other scales. In the first place, I may say that the cost of the salaries under this scale would, I estimate, come to £383,416. Compared with the first alternative scale, B, there is an increase in the salaries of head-teachers at schools of from 70 in average attendance, but there is a decrease in the higher salaries, no capitation being given beyond £375. The salary of the infant mistress at a school of from 40 to 50 was set down in the first alternative scale at £90, but in this scale it is £80, which is as high as the salary paid in any district to the infant mistress at a school of that class. Then at a school of from 50 to 70 the salary of the mistress is put down at £85—as high as that paid in Otago, and £5 higher than any other district—and from 70 to 90 it is placed at £100. Otago, which is the highest at that stage, pays £100 in a school of 76 to 100. In all cases the salaries of assistants, where they are increased, begin at a number lower, rather than at a number higher, than under the several Boards, so that the increases begin sooner. The salaries of the masters at the large schools in Christchurch, which, with one exception at Napier, are the highest salaries in the colony when you take into account the payment for instruction of pupil-teachers—I have taken this item into account in all cases in this scale—would be £375 and house allowance, as against £361 and house allowance—£14 more. The salaries of first assistants are the highest nominally in Dunedin, but it came out in evidence that in Christchurch they are really somewhat higher, because the first assistants get part of the remuneration given for instruction of pupil-teachers: they run from £240 to £250. The salary of the first assistants is here set down at £250. The maximum salary of the second assistant I have placed at £175, the same as the top limit in Christchurch and Otago, but it is reached earlier in Otago than Christchurch. The salaries lower down seem to be lower than the Otago scale, and I should like to point out how the case is met. Take a school of 480: according to this scale the salary for the second male assistant is £130, or £115 for a female second assistant. The salary of the second assistant under the Otago scale is £175 at a school of over 500. Note *d* at the foot of the scale bears on this point: "Instead of an assistant a pupil-teacher may be employed, £45 being added to the salary of another assistant." So that if a pupil-teacher is taken instead of the last assistant at £80, £45 is added to the salary of the second assistant, making it £175. The staff would then consist of the headmaster, five assistants, and six pupil-teachers, which is the staffing allowed at that limit, I think, by the Otago scale; and I may say that at that stage the Otago staffing is fairly liberal. It is at the grade below that the Otago staffing is not quite so strong, but that is where the second assistant comes in with the high salary. As far as I can see I have met the Otago, Southland, and Canterbury cases. The staffing proposed in this scale is below the Christchurch staffing in one case, that of the West Christchurch School, which the Board admits is overstaffed now. You will notice one thing in regard to the salaries of assistants that may seem peculiar. I have not numbered the assistants' salaries. I have left the numbers out, so that the Boards can rank the assistants as they like—alternately male and female, or first, second, third, &c., male, and first, second, third, &c., female. Beginning with the third assistant, the salaries for male and female assistants are equal—from £80 to £160. If a female is appointed there, she is the headmistress or the infant mistress, and that allows the Christchurch schools, and schools like them, to have a headmistress at a salary not less than the present salary. If a master is appointed he is the only third master, so it practically makes the salary of the first mistress equal to the salary of the third master, but a Board can appoint which it likes. Without making any difference in the total amount of salary, I have thus allowed the Boards to put either a first mistress after the first two assistants, or a third master, whichever they like.

3385. *Mr. Davidson.*] As a matter of fact a Board might, if it thought fit, have the second assistant a female?—Yes; if it liked. Take a school with an average attendance of, say 840.

Under this scale the headmaster would get £372; under the Canterbury scale he would get £325, and as much as £45 more for the instruction of pupil-teachers—£370. Then the first assistant would get £250 under this scale, as against £225, *plus* pupil-teacher allowances, which may be as much as £18, bringing him up to about £243. The next one is the mistress, who gets £185 under the Canterbury scale, with a possible share of the pupil-teacher instruction money, which may bring her salary up to £200 or over. Under this scale she may take the salary of the mistress, £210. Then the next assistant under the Christchurch scale gets £167: this scale would give £170. Then comes the infant mistress at £155: under this scale she could take the third assistant's salary of £160. And so, all the way through, this scale is a little better than the Christchurch scale in regard to those schools.

3386. *Mr. Weston.*] Have the complaints of the lady teachers and the assistant masters of Christchurch been given effect to?—Yes; the lady teachers would get increases—for instance, the highest salary payable to a second assistant female in Christchurch is between £120 and £130: under this scale the salary would be £135 if the Board chose to give her the position.

3387. *The Chairman.*] Will you please take the Masterton School, and compare the salaries paid there with those that would be paid under this scale?—The headmaster's salary is £295 and £50 house allowance: the proposed scale would increase his salary to £320. The first assistant is at present getting £220: he would get £240 under this scale; the second assistant gets £150, but I will leave him for the present; the third assistant gets £100: his salary under this scale would be £115; the first female assistant receives £90: the salary available for her here would be £150—if it was thought that she was not worth that the Board could transfer some one else, but that would be the salary for the mistress; the second female assistant gets £90 also: there would be a salary of £110 available for her under this scale; the third female assistant receives £80: under this she would get £80 also. The scale would allow five pupil-teachers instead of four—the number at the school. Of course the salaries of pupil-teachers would depend on the year; but an ex-pupil-teacher, who is receiving an allowance for being away from home, making her salary £60, would receive £55 under the scale—a fall of £5; there is another ex-pupil-teacher receiving £40: she would get £50; the next one is another ex-pupil-teacher at £42: she would receive £50 also; the last one is a second year pupil-teacher at £25: she would get £30 under this scale. Then the scale would allow one more pupil-teacher, but a note at the bottom says: "Instead of adding a pupil-teacher a Board may add £35 to the salary of an assistant." Now, if that £35 were added to the salary of the second assistant he would get £165, an increase of £15 on his present salary. If that were done, the total staff would be the same as the present; but that staff is, I think, one more than the school is entitled to under the Wellington scale. The only salary that would be reduced under this scale of mine would be that of one of the ex-pupil-teachers.

3388. *Mr. Stewart.*] Would not the salary of that ex-pupil-teacher fall under the regulations of the Wellington Board?—Yes, that is so. The other scale that I prepared—the one that goes outside the £4 capitation limit, scale D—is being printed, and will be ready on Monday. In drawing up this scale C I have not been able, as I should have liked, to take away the provision for the deductions on account of certificates, because I did not see my way to save the £10,000 thus gained in any other way. I have altered the certificates in one place, where no appreciable difference would be made: I have replaced E5 for schools of from 14 to 19 by E4, and E2 by E3 for schools of from 19 to 40. One balances the other. In the other scale, D—the one going outside the £4 limit—I have taken away the deductions on account of certificates altogether. If the Commission would like it, I will hand in a statement showing the total cost of the salaries under that scale. There are one or two other points that I should like to refer to. One is with reference to a suggestion that was made in evidence—*i.e.*, to make £300 the maximum salary. If this were done and the amount thus saved were distributed amongst the other head-teachers, teachers in schools above 19, they would benefit to the extent of about £1 1s. each. The next point is with regard to the general expenses of Boards. I want to ask whether the Commission desire me to put in an alternative method of distribution to that proposed—viz., on the basis of £250 to each Board, and 11s. 3d. per head. There was a general desire expressed that I should do so, when I suggested to a witness that so much might be paid on the first 100, so much on the second, and so on—a kind of sliding-scale—but the Commission did not ask me to do so. If the Commission desire me to put in an alternative method of distribution, I will do so. I wish now to refer to the question of house allowance. I want to emphasize once more the necessity there is for the Commission's making provision for house allowance. I have said so before, but I think I shall not be considered to be repeating myself unnecessarily if I refer to the point again, because I feel that, unless house allowance is considered, the salaries must necessarily be unequal. Then, with regard to relieving-teachers: I think some provision should be made for that. There are two principal reasons—they are not the only reasons—why relieving-teachers are needed. One is, to fill a temporary vacancy in a school. There no difficulty arises, because the salary, being allotted to the position, is available for the payment of the temporary teacher just as it is available for the payment of a permanent teacher. Then, in the case of sickness, a relieving-teacher is required. There provision is not made for the payment of a relieving-teacher, because when a teacher is sick he is paid his salary for a certain time. I think the time for which such salary is paid ought to vary according to the length of time which he has been in the teaching service, not necessarily under one particular Board, but in the teaching service of the colony. I do not think the system of sick-pay should be made too liberal, because, as Mr. Robertson, I think, has said, a liberal scale of sick-pay might induce more sickness. I think that in some cases sick-pay might be granted up to six months' absence, on certain conditions. There would not be many cases in which it would be found necessary to grant as much as six months' leave; after that there should be provision for retirement, or temporary retirement. Of course, relieving-teachers of several kinds would be required—one to take the place of headmasters at fair-sized

schools. I do not think a relieving-teacher would be wanted to take the place of a master at a large school, because the first assistant could act temporarily; but you would have to have a relieving-teacher to take the place left vacant in the school when the staff was reorganized temporarily. In other schools a relieving-teacher would be wanted simply to take the place of the absent teacher without a rearrangement of the staff at all. Those are the points, sir, that I wish to emphasize. If the Commission are going to make any recommendation in regard to the question of teachers' certificates I should like to be called; but, as I take it that it is only indirectly concerned with the order of reference, it would be out of place for me to assume that the Commission was going to deal with the question in a direct manner, but if it is I should like to be called, and the same applies to the question of training-colleges. It is only indirectly that I have expressed any opinion with regard to training-colleges, and, if that question is to be considered, I should like to have an opportunity of expressing my views.

3389. *Mr. Hill.*] There seems to me to be a class of school to which this scale would not apply. In Hawke's Bay we have four or five schools that we call "side-schools," and we allow children to attend those schools only up to Standard II. When they have passed Standard II. they are transferred to the main school. What I should like to know in connection with the side-school is this: Would you suggest that a side-school be considered as forming a part of a main school, and allow the headmaster of the main school to rearrange and modify the staff at the side-school as he deems best?—I am glad you have reminded me of that. I had intended speaking on that point. I am firmly of the opinion that as long as a school is a side-school—a school from which pupils have to be transferred to another—it should be under the direction of the headmaster of the main school. The two schools should count as one in the matter of staffing. For the purposes of salaries, I have treated the side-schools as forming part of the main schools. With regard to separate schools for boys and girls, I should like to amend the supplementary scale that I put in, so as to make it agree with this (C). The former supplementary scale agreed with the first scheme (A); the salaries are modified, and on the same principle I should like to make the supplementary scale agree with this. I think that no Board should be encouraged to make separate schools. The sheet that I handed in before only applied to the first scale; if you read it you will find that it does not agree with this one. I took all the schools that were separate in the colony, set down the salaries for them, added them together with the schools to which they were presumed to belong, and divided the salaries between them.

3390. *The Chairman.*] And arranged the salaries so that there would be no increased cost?—Yes.

3391. *Mr. Weston.*] In regard to your amended scale: what do you propose to do with schools under 14?—I have expressed myself with regard to those schools. I am not quite certain whether my opinion has not been modified by the evidence which I have heard.

3392. What are your views now?—That perhaps a little more check would be wanted. I do not think the check should be such as to interfere with the establishment of schools—fairly small schools—if they are wanted. There might be cases where it would be rather hard to leave, say, six children without any means of securing education.

3393. What would you propose to do with them?—I do not like to say that salaries should be lower than £60, but salaries lower than £60 are being paid now; in one such case £10 a year and board is the teacher's remuneration. I think that Boards could deal with cases such as those in some way like this: this Commission should name a minimum salary, and the Boards might be allowed to require contributions from the parents if they thought fit. Board and lodging might be counted up to, say, £30; the Boards could count board and lodging as less, if they liked. Supposing there were six children, the capitation would amount to £30, and if board and lodging were provided it would bring the amount to £60. I think any limitation should be as liberal as possible, because the circumstances differ a great deal in the different districts. I would suggest that the Commission should say that the Boards might have the power to require contributions in cases where they thought fit, and they might count board and lodging for such a purpose as equivalent to any sum not greater than £30 a year. I do not like the idea of a teacher receiving only £60 a year—less than a domestic servant—but it would be rather a serious thing to interfere suddenly with those forty schools in Marlborough where the teachers get less than £60.

3394. I hold in my hand a memorandum from the Inspectors of the North Canterbury Board: they say, "We very strongly object to postponing the introduction of the first pupil-teacher till an average of 91 is reached; the lower average of 81 is unquestionably much to be preferred." You have it at 91, have you not?—Yes, 90.

3395. What do you think of the complaint preferred by the Inspectors?—At present a pupil-teacher is introduced in North Canterbury at 91, so that this scale is as liberal as the present North Canterbury scale in that respect. The North Canterbury Inspectors, I take it, want the scale to be more liberal. If it could be afforded I should like to strengthen the staffing at 81. I have not even proposed it in my extended scheme, because I do not think that the need there is so great as it is at one or two other places lower down or higher up.

3396. If it were not for the question of finance you would approve of the suggestion?—Yes, but, as I say, there are one or two other places where the need is greater.

3397. The North Canterbury Inspectors also consider that a second pupil-teacher should be introduced at 110: What is your opinion?—That is a corollary of the other. I prefer that the next addition should not be a pupil-teacher at all, but a certificated teacher. In my suggested alternative scales, B and C, I put a second pupil-teacher in at 120 only to save expense.

3398. After hearing the evidence which has been given, Mr. Hogben, do you still feel it incumbent upon you to stand hard-and-fast to this scale, or do you think that, apart from the question of money, still further improvements might be effected?—This scale is drawn up under

the £4 capitation limit, and I think the Commission know by this time what great restrictions that imposes on you.

3399. What else would you do if it were not for the £4 capitation limit?—I would sweep away the whole of the deductions on account of certificates if I had the money. In this scale I have swept away the deductions for sewing-mistresses. I would rather leave the girls at the 220 schools (I think that is the number) that are under masters and not mistresses to learn sewing at home than that the masters should lose £10 a year each.

3400. Do you think, as a matter of fact, that the girls would learn sewing at home?—In some cases they would, and in others they would not. In very few cases in which the sewing is taught by outsiders is it worth anything at all, in my opinion.

3401. You think the least evil would be to run the risk of the children being taught sewing in their own homes?—Yes; necessity will compel them to learn a certain amount of sewing.

3402. *Mr. Luke.*] Does not the Education Act provide that sewing should be taught?—Yes, but that would have to be altered.

3403. *Mr. Weston.*] Mr. Davidson has just called my attention to this regulation in regard to the New South Wales schools: "In a school containing female children, but no female teacher, it will be the duty of the teacher's wife to teach needlework to the girls at least four hours in each week. In forming an estimate of the efficiency of the school the competency and usefulness of the teacher's wife and the time she devotes to the duties will be taken into account." What do you think of such a regulation as that—*i.e.*, changing the four hours to two? Again, what do you think of the principle of the regulation?—There is a good deal to be said on both sides. I think it is rather important that girls should learn sewing, and learn it well. If they were always taught well, I should not have any hesitation in keeping the deduction of £10 in. A point was made at one place—Nelson, I think—of compelling the teacher's wife to teach sewing, in order that the man might have his £10. I do not think there is any great hardship in requiring a woman to teach twelve or fifteen girls for two hours a week. I do not see any great objection to that regulation.

3404. You have pointed out two directions in which you think this scale might be improved if money did not enter into the calculation: is there any other? It would be valuable to us, because we shall have to consider a scale over and above the £4 capitation limit?—I should like to raise the salary of the second assistants in certain cases without using one of the devices shown in the notes at the foot of the scale. In some cases it is necessary that you should revert to one of those devices, in order to keep the salaries of the second assistants up to what they are at present. If those devices are acted upon the salary of no second assistant in the colony, I think, will suffer.

3405. But without those devices?—With those devices the scale of staffing is as strong as it is under any Board in the colony, but I should like to see it made stronger. I should like to see the salaries of the second assistants brought up to the highest scale without having recourse to these devices.

3406. Is there anything else?—Yes; I should like to see pupil-teachers swept away altogether. It is a very big question; the cost would not be the only thing to be considered, though it might mean something like £15,000, perhaps a little less.

3407. You would sweep away pupil-teachers and substitute certificated teachers at £80 a year?—Yes; but I do not see how it is possible to replace 680 pupil-teachers with teachers at £80 a year. The 340 teachers substituted would have to be promoted year by year as well as the others.

3408. You think the excess of expenditure under such a system would be very large?—I estimated the cost once, but on the basis of a different number of pupil-teachers. The difference would be something not exceeding £15,000; perhaps not more than £10,000. Of course, the change could not be made without the complete equipment of training-colleges.

3409. Supposing you were left with discretion to employ pupil-teachers, or to expend the extra sum and employ certificated teachers, how would you exercise your discretion?—I should gradually do away with pupil-teachers. I do not think it would do to abolish them suddenly, because that would imply changes in the buildings as well.

3410. You would gradually work out the pupil-teachers?—Yes; I should introduce a sliding-scale, under which pupil-teachers would gradually disappear after a number of years.

3411. I should like to ask whether these suggested amendments to your scheme, made by the Inspectors of North Canterbury, would meet with your approval, or be worthy of consideration?—I should like to look at them before I passed judgment. I should be very happy to express an opinion if I had an opportunity of studying the suggestions.

3412. *Mr. Weston.*] I will hand them in. Do you think there is anything else that would be worthy of amendment in the principle of your scale?—I should like to think that over. I might say, however, that I do not think the highest salaries here are quite so high as they ought to be. I should like to see a general rise, beginning with the minimum salary.

3413. What do you think the minimum salary for a certificated teacher should be raised to?—I think it ought not to be less than £100.

3414. Have you considered the question as to the maximum salary of a teacher?—A preliminary question to that is, what is the maximum size of a school? Because I hold very strongly—having been connected with large and small schools a good deal, up to a school of 1,400, in one sort of way—that when a school gets very large it is almost killing work for the master to do it conscientiously.

3415. Would you limit the size of a school?—The difficulty is, in what sort of way would you want it limited?

3416. In establishing new schools, would you limit the number of pupils?—Yes. There should not be more than 500 at one school.

3417. You would hesitate before suggesting any such limitation with regard to those now existing?—Yes.

3418. You have told us what you think should be the minimum salary paid to a teacher: will you now kindly tell us what additions you think should be made to the salaries of teachers generally? You said that you would like to see salaries raised?—I should raise the minimum, and make just as good increases, and rather better, up to £300 a year. I do not think that a man who has a school of nearly 1,000 children is getting too much salary at £500 a year—in fact, I do not think he is getting enough.

3419. Have you considered what amount of capitation grant would be required to frame a scale such as you, with your large experience, would approve?—I have not; I am afraid it is not within the region of practical politics.

3420. Leaving the pupil-teachers as they are, and yet increasing the salaries of the certificated teachers, can you tell us what capitation grant would suffice?—I have not worked it out.

3421. Would £4 10s. capitation grant supply a scale more upon your favoured lines?—Yes; it would not bring up the highest salaries, but nearly all the others—probably most of them. It would not bring the lowest assistants up to £100, but there is no great hardship in a youth or a young woman of twenty or twenty-one beginning at £80, though I think they are worth more. There is a hardship in a married man taking a school at £130 and a house.

3422. You were good enough to make a lengthy statement at the opening sittings of this Commission: do you, after hearing so much testimony on the various points that you then touched upon, stand by all that you said, or are your views modified on any of them?—In the main my views are just the same; but I do not suppose that any reasonable man could have listened to the amount of evidence which has been given without qualifying his views to some extent.

3423. I merely ask that question in your own interests, so that your views may be quite understood by the teaching staff throughout the colony?—I have modified some of my views.

3424. *Mr. Luke.*] I take it from what you have said that you differ from the views expressed by Mr. Lee in regard to large schools. He said he thought a school of 1,500 children would be a good thing in a largely-populated centre, and I understood him to say that he thought a school of that size could be more cheaply managed, and the teaching would be better?—I spoke of a school of 1,400: the one I refer to is in London; it is divided into three parts—almost three separate schools—and the work even then is killing work. I see some advantages in a large school, but there are several objections. There is an advantage in being able to classify pupils as fully as possible, but I hold that in a primary school of 500 children you can get all the classification that is wanted. It is a disadvantage when the number of pupils is so great that the headmaster can practically have no real knowledge of the character of a child—I do not say merely the intellectual power—or a very superficial one. A schoolmaster should not be solely dependent upon his assistants for an opinion of a child, but when the number of pupils at a school is much more than 500 he must be almost solely dependant on the assistants. I think that 500 is a quite large enough number of children to have at one school. If you wish to ask me whether I would prefer separate boys', girls', and infants' schools, I say no. I am against the breaking of primary schools into three parts in this colony. In cities like London or Glasgow the conditions are quite different.

3425. *Mr. Hill.*] You think, Mr. Hogben, that a unified scale of salaries is desirable?—What do you mean by "unified"?

3426. A scale which is common to all the schools in the colony—a uniform scale?—Yes, I do.

3427. In your opinion, the principle of equal pay for equal work should be recognised among teachers?—I do not recognise the principle of equal pay for equal work as a just one at all.

3428. Then, on what basis would you apportion salaries?—On the basis of equal pay for equal burdens.

3429. That is the view you advocate in suggesting the construction of a colonial scale?—Not altogether: that is the view I take.

3430. You think that equal burdens should carry equal salaries?—Yes, I recognise that in the abstract; but in drawing up a scale of salaries you cannot always adhere to abstract principles; the question of expediency, of adjustment to existing circumstances, largely enters in.

3431. You propose to give the same salary to the same sized schools?—Yes; but you are pressing me on the abstract principle, not on the formation of a scale.

3432. Well, then, the principle of equal pay for equal work should be recognised?—I am not free, nor is the Commission, to ignore existing conditions, and frame a scale on an abstract principle.

3433 You said, "Equal pay for equal burdens": are the burdens equal in the case of a bachelor and a man with a family?—I did not say I had framed my scales on that principle. I said I was not free to frame a scale on any abstract principle whatever.

3434. You assume that in schools of the same size there will be equal efficiency?—I do not understand what you mean.

3435. You give equal pay to teachers at similar-sized schools; is it because you assume that the results at those schools will be equal?—No, that would be equal pay for equal work. I have not drawn up this scale on any abstract principle whatever; it is a scale drawn up on expediency, with as much attention to justice as the limits allow me to make.

3435. Then you do not recognise that there is justice in the scale?—There is as near an approach to abstract justice as the conditions will allow.

3437. You consider that environment is nothing, and should not enter as a factor in the making-up of a scale?—No, I do not.

3438. Where is it shown in this scale? The salaries are the same for schools of the same size?—I do not quite understand what you mean by "environment."

3439. You give the same salary to the same class of school, no matter where the school is situated, or what the conditions are?—What portion of the environment do you refer to.

3440. All those factors that distinguish one district from another—the difference in the cost of living, the difficulties of getting supplies, and all the surrounding circumstances?—The word "environment," as ordinarily used, includes more than that.

3441. Well, everything that modifies the individual?—It is too great a question to discuss.

3442. I simply want your opinions?—You are giving me abstract principles to discuss.

3443. Will not the argument for a colonial scale hold equally for a maintenance scale to School Committees?—No, not at all.

3444. Should environment, which you mentioned yesterday, be considered in the amounts payable to School Committees?—I do not think I mentioned it at all. Possibly it should be considered by the Boards.

3445. Why?—The Boards simply have to supply to the Committees enough to meet their reasonable expenses.

3446. If you classify the schools exactly as you have classified the staffing and the payments on that staffing, might it not be possible also to prepare in the same way a scale for payment of sums to the Committees for maintenance?—I do not think so, because the Committees' expenses vary so much throughout the colony.

3447. Why do they vary?—Owing to the difference in the cost of firewood, the conditions under which the cleaning has to be done, &c. The cost of sanitary arrangements, and so on, varies so much that in one part of the colony it amounts to twice as much as in another.

3448. Do not the differences in the prices of commodities apply equally in the case of teachers?—No, certainly not. I think that even the evidence does not show much difference in the cost of living. My opinion is that the difference in the cost of living in different parts of the colony is very much less than the difference in the cost of living in different parts of England.

3449. Do you think that the same compensating advantages that apply to teachers apply also to School Committees?—No, I do not; the range of School Committees' expenses is so small; it depends on the cost of two or three things only.

3450. Then the teachers are the greater sufferers in the matter of environment?—Not at all. There are compensating elements in the more expensive districts, as far as money is concerned.

3451. My point is that whatever compensating advantages there are for the teachers apply equally to the School Committees—the same compensating advantages exist in the one case as in the other?—It is the expenses that the School Committees have to meet that vary so much; in the case of teachers, there are compensating elements to take into account.

3452. Do you not consider that it is just as well for the department to formulate a scale as to allow the Education Boards to differentiate between the Committees' allowances as they do?—No. There are a great many other expenses besides these of School Committees, and I think it would be an extremely difficult thing to frame a scale so that you should differentiate between those expenses in one district and another. I do not think it is advisable to try. The Boards know the expenses of School Committees for firewood and other things, and should draw up their scales accordingly.

3453. You think that, while there should be a differentiation in the matter of School Committees' allowances, there should be none in the case of teachers' salaries—that is, there should be a colonial scale, and not a differentiating one for the different education districts?—I do not think the two things are on all-fours at all.

3454. What public benefits do you think are likely to arise from the establishment of a colonial scale of salaries for teachers?—The greatest argument for a colonial scale is the argument of justice. It seems to me manifestly unjust that a teacher in one part should receive 100 per cent. more salary than a teacher in another part doing precisely the same work; and there is that disparity in a few extreme cases.

3455. Do you consider that teachers should be deemed public servants?—In what sense do you mean "public servants"?

3456. In the sense of being employed directly by the Government for specific work—say, Civil servants?—That is to say, do away with the Boards?

3457. I did not say that?—That is the corollary to it.

3458. I was going to ask you that. Would it necessitate the taking of teachers from the control of the Boards?—You could still have Boards, but they would have very different functions; functions which they now possess would be taken away from them.

3459. You recognise that Education Boards in any case should possess some special functions?—Certainly, very important functions.

3460. You would propose to take away some of the functions defined in the Education Act, section 35?—Yes; but they would still retain the following powers: to establish and maintain public schools, to establish school districts, to divide or combine school districts, to appoint and remove officers and teachers, to establish scholarships, school libraries, and district high schools, to administer the funds granted by the Education Department, and all other funds which may become the property of the Board, &c.

3461. The Boards would administer the funds granted to them?—Yes.

3462. But they would administer a capitation grant of only 11s. 3d., whereas they now administer £3 15s. capitation?—They do not administer as much as 11s. 3d. now: they administer something like 10s. 6d.

3463. You mean to say that the Boards legislate?—Yes, they make local legislation.

3464. Then, they are acting illegally?—No; they are given powers of legislation; nearly every local body has the power of legislation.

3465. Do you know of any department in England, in Europe, or in America, or elsewhere that constructs a scale of salaries for its teachers and gives it to what is legally known as an administrative body merely to distribute?—The Board in North Canterbury gives the money to the Committees to distribute to the teachers.

3466. I said a department of education?—There are many instances of the same thing in other departments; but I do not recall any Education Department that acts just in that way.

3467. You recognise that the Education Act must be modified in order to carry out this proposed scale?—Yes.

3468. Would this limitation of function lessen or not the authority of Education Boards?—No, I do not think it would.

3469. Then, you consider the colony would benefit by a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes, I do.

3470. Educationally?—Yes.

3471. Morally?—Indirectly; if it benefited the people educationally it would benefit them morally.

3472. Of course, it would benefit them physically and socially?—The connection becomes a little remote there.

3473. Do you think that, with the wide experience of thirteen Education Boards during the past twenty-three years, they should not be able to determine the special needs of districts, and adapt teachers and salaries to the needs of districts, better than a central department could possibly do it?—I do not think that there is any likelihood that they would or could.

3474. Has there not been a tendency in these various districts to adapt the education to the conditions and circumstances of the various districts?—There has been that tendency that there would be in any body of reasonable men, but they have not always been moved by the same ideas. In any body of reasonable men, with a desire to do their work, there would be some kind of attempt to approximate to the conditions, and there have been numerous attempts made by the Boards to do so. In some cases the Boards could not do justice to those employed in their own districts—they had not the necessary funds; in other cases they have worked according to different ideas. One Board has had one idea, and another Board another, with the best intentions in each case, no doubt; and, of course, the effects produced have been different.

3475. Do you think that teachers would be able to make their claims known as effectively under a central system as under Education Boards?—It is not part of my proposal that they should be under a central system.

3476. But in the matter of salaries?—They would not be under a central system. The Boards would have the choice as to which individual should go to a school and receive such-and-such a salary.

3477. What I want to bring out is this: the payments would be according to a scale formulated by the central department?—The scale would not be formulated by the central department; my conception is that it would be a scale recommended, say, by this Commission, and made part of an Act of Parliament.

3478. Do you suggest or assume that it would be found necessary to modify that scale?—I think so. I do not see that it should be modified oftener than it would be reasonable to introduce a slight modifying Act. I can conceive that it might be possible—it is not part of my recommendation—for an Act to be drawn up empowering the Education Department, or, rather, the Governor in Council, to draw up a scale; but in a case of that kind I think the conditions ought to be very stringent as to the limits of the scale.

3479. *Mr. Weston.*] Public opinion might change?—Public opinion is very fickle sometimes. I think that in a case like that certain restrictions should be placed on the powers of the Governor in Council. I am rather inclined to say, Draw up a scale, make the best you can, and have it passed into an Act of Parliament, any modification of it being thus required to be by Act of Parliament.

3480. *Mr. Hill.*] My point is this: that at the present time the teachers are so much in touch with the several Education Boards that they can influence the Boards much more quickly than they could the General Government?—I hardly see how that consideration affects the question of the introduction of a colonial scale. Boards do not now consult teachers when they draw up their scales of salaries, certainly not when they reduce salaries. At any rate, nearly all the teachers in the colony seem to be in favour of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries.

3481. You are aware that the Australian States have each a centralised system of education?—Yes.

3482. They have no Education Boards and no School Committees?—They have Boards of Advice, having different powers—more in some States than in others.

3483. But there are no School Committees and Boards of Education, as we understand them here?—There is not much difference, in some cases, between the Boards of Advice and School Committees.

3484. The Boards of Advice have no power to appoint teachers?—Their recommendations in regard to teachers have sometimes considerable weight in the actual appointments.

3485. Are you fairly conversant with the systems in operation in Australia?—I am.

3486. Have you seen several schools in the different States?—Yes.

3487. Do you think the following remarks, contrasting a centralised system and a local system of control in education, are true? The article from which the quotation is taken was written by a gentleman who visited the Australian schools, and compared them with those of New Zealand: "Education is *per se* for the people, but the people have no controlling voice in those colonies beyond what their representatives may say in the Parliament of the country. The will of the Minister of Education is the will of his executive officers, whose authority extends into every schoolroom and influences the training of every child in the public schools. Local interest is dead, for the people have already become the true Lotus-eaters of education, the only prevailing thought among them being the right to have their children taught in Government schools. A system such as this may free the teachers from local oversight and harass such as many teachers

have felt in New Zealand, but I doubt whether a teacher's independence is as great in Australia as in New Zealand, and certainly there is much less room for the growth of individuality in Australian schools, because everything in school management and control has to be carried out according to orders issued by the central department. If local government such as we have in this country had free 'scope in dealing with a scheme of public instruction like that of New South Wales, I do not doubt that the results would be better than they now are. Public interest in the progress of education is of paramount importance, for once the public recognise the need they devise means to sustain that need, though the central authority should be weak and impotent. Local districts in this country vie with each other in making their schools attractive and efficient, and though School Committees sometimes overstep the bounds of prudence in matters relating to school government, even this is to be preferred to the deadness and the indifference which are the products of centralism, under which the self-reliance of a people is slowly but surely destroyed, whilst dependence is fostered and recognised as a necessary constituent of democracy"?—There are too many statements in that for me to say in one sentence whether they are all true or not. If you mean, Do I believe in centralism or not? I say I am opposed to centralism. Centralism in the extreme sense means the concentration of all real control in a central department, leaving only a small local Board of Advice. You should, I think, have effective local government in some form, not merely local Boards of Advice.

3488. Do you consider, with your knowledge of the scales in the different education districts, that an increase of 10s. capitation would enable those districts to pay salaries as large for the several schools as is proposed in your scale—the last one (scale C)?—An increase of 5s. all over the colony would; 10s. would not do it for Westland; that is the only district I have tried.

3489. You say 5s. would do it if spread over the whole colony?—Yes.

3490. Supposing the 5s. or the 10s. was ear-marked for salaries, but the differentiations left as they are now in the different districts, would such a course as that, in your opinion, be advisable?—No.

3491. The order of reference of the Commission requires the construction of a scale on the basis of a £4 capitation grant: is that not so?—Yes.

3492. Your first scale was based on that grant?—Yes; payable not to the Boards, but on the total number of children throughout the colony—payable out of the Treasury.

3493. Assuming that an education district has 1,000 children in average attendance, have you allocated that district a capitation grant of £4, for example?—It has not been awarded yet; it is simply a proposal.

3494. You have been given an extra grant of 5s. for distribution?—There has been a sum of £8,250 available for distribution.

3495. You have not given that at the rate of 5s. to each education district?—It is given on an approximately uniform basis for the whole colony, to bring salaries up to the first scale; the distribution is not quite uniform, because the circumstances differ.

3496. Your first proposal, or suggested scheme, was made on that basis?—Yes.

3497. And you recommended the adoption of that scale to the Commission, did you not?—Yes; with certain qualifications.

3498. What were the qualifications?—I named them in my evidence-in-chief.

3499. You were bound by certain conditions?—Yes.

3500. You have come now, after hearing evidence throughout the colony, to think that your scale has certain defects?—I thought it had certain defects at the time; it was a question whether those defects should disappear or whether other defects should take their place.

3501. The defects which have appeared from your acquaintance with the various facts throughout the colony are very different from the defects which you assume?—There are defects in the alternative scale; it is a substitution of one set of defects for the other set of defects.

3502. Assuming the scale had been adopted without inquiry by the Commission, would it have been accepted by the teachers?—The teachers' point of view is not the only point of view; there are other aspects of the case.

3503. You recognise there are defects?—Yes, in both schemes.

3504. Circumstances have arisen which have caused you to modify your views?—My views are not modified in that sense: they are modified in some senses. The principal issue is the question as to what proportion of money you should devote to strengthen the staffing to increase the salaries respectively. In the first scale there is more devoted to strengthening the staffing than in the second scale; in the second scale more is devoted to increasing salaries than in the first scale.

3505. It is simply an adjustment between the staff and salaries?—That is the principal thing; there are one or two other details.

3506. But the money has been otherwise distributed?—That is the principal thing in the drawing-up of a colonial scale; the distribution of a temporary vote was a different matter; it was not desirable, even if possible, to disturb the staffing of the several Boards.

3507. I understand there is another scheme coming before the Commission?—It has been laid on the table. I have a rough copy of it here; the other copy is in the hands of the printer.

3508. What is the amount of the capitation grant upon which the new scale is based?—It is drawn up without reference to capitation.

3509. Can you give me an approximate estimate of how much it will amount to?—I can tell you very nearly. The salaries of teachers—I am not certain of the exact figures, as I have not had time to check them—amount to about £14,000 more; £10,096 of which comes from doing away with deductions on certificates—that is to say, the deductions on certificates under scale A, B, or C amount to £10,096. I should say the whole cost of scale D is from £14,000 to £15,000 more than that of scale C.

3510. The increase in the capitation grant of 5s. which is proposed will amount to about £28,000?—Yes.

3511. Another increase of 2s. 6d. in the capitation grant will comply with the requirements of the scale you are suggesting?—Yes; of course, if the Boards want their allowances increased, that will mean a further addition to the grant.

3512. It would not be more than 5s.?—I understand they want an increase of 2s. 6d., which is a very large amount for Boards' expenses.

3513. I mean the grant would come to about £4 5s.?—Yes.

3514. Has it not been paid in previous times?—Yes; £3 15s. has been paid ever since 1877, and an additional 10s. was paid for some years.

3515. From your wide experience and knowledge of the colony, you recognise that the conditions in the various districts now are more varied in the matter of demand than they were a few years ago?—I do not think the cost of living has increased.

3516. I am speaking in regard to the difference in demands made on the Education Boards at the present time, and ten or fifteen years ago?—I do not think that the demands upon Education Boards have increased. The building grant, with the exception of two or three years, is rather larger than it was at one time. The Boards are paying more out of the building grants than they were previously. During the last few years the amount transferred from building to maintenance has been very little.

3517. It is not because Boards are more prodigal with their allowances; it is on account of circumstances arising over which they have no control, is it not?—Yes; I think you can reasonably expect the expenses of the Boards, apart from such considerations as buildings, to be greater than they were before.

3518. Causes have been operating like that?—Yes; I think you should expect salaries to rise also.

3519. Do you think if the capitation grant was raised to the old level—£4 5s.—and that amount was available at the present time, it would meet all the demands which your department has made upon it by Education Boards, and would meet the proposed scales?—Yes; of course, there are other things besides that.

3520. I mean external to matters of science and technical subjects: I am talking about primary education pure and simple, not manual instruction?—I regard manual instruction as part of primary education, and I do not think you can separate them.

3521. If £4 5s. was available at the present time, could primary education in the colony be carried out effectively and efficiently, speaking from your experience and knowledge of the colony?—If the £4 5s. grant were spread over the whole colony—not if it were paid to separate Boards.

3522. If such was the case it would enable a scale of salaries to be paid as high as you propose should be paid in any of your scales?—Yes.

3523. You could pay teachers' salaries?—Yes; and give 2s. 6d. extra to Boards.

3524. You mean on a capitation allowance of £4 5s. instead of £3 15s.?—Yes; it is always subject to the idea that as soon as the scale is adopted there is no capitation at all.

3525. I take it that you suggest that the Commission should consider this scale which is now being printed—scale D—on a capitation of £4 2s. 6d.: do you consider that advisable?—I hardly say I recommend it; it is a question of policy that I am not justified in taking up.

3526. Then, you do not recommend it?—I neither recommend it nor do I take the opposite course.

3527. You supply it as information?—Yes.

3528. Information which might become of value to the Commission during the consideration of the salaries-scale question?—I should like to make it quite clear. This scheme C is within the limits laid down in the order of reference of the Commission, and if I am asked to give evidence I presume it is within my rights as a witness to have recommended this scheme as within the order of reference. I would not undertake to recommend the scheme D, outside the limits, without conferring with the Minister.

3529. You are aware that we are limited to a four-pound capitation grant?—Yes.

3530. Do you think that the Commission should ask for an amendment of the order of reference?—I do not know; that question rests with the Commission, I think.

3531. Do you consider the Commission may recommend a scale outside the order of reference?—That is a question of the interpretation of the meaning of the order of reference. I think it should rest in the hands of the Chairman of the Commission, who should be guided by the opinions of members of the Commission.

3532. If you suggest that possibility, it seems to me that this Commission, according to your view of it, may ask the Minister for an amendment of the order of reference: is that not so?—It is undoubtedly within the power of the Commission.

3533. You think that it is within the power of the Commission to ask for an amendment?—Yes, I presume so.

3534. Do you think it would be improper for this Commission to recommend a scale outside the order of reference, and in addition to the scales submitted?—I do not think it is for me to settle what it is proper for the Commission to do; I think that is a question for the Commission.

3535. I see you have put down in scale C the required certificate: I understand it has been put down as a means to provide funds to work the salaries scale?—Well, it was in the original scale. There are a good many arguments in favour of keeping it in, so as to encourage young teachers to improve their status. Since putting it in, I feel that the arguments on the other side are rather stronger than appeared to me at first. Even when I first brought the proposal forward to introduce the certificate, I expressed some doubts as to whether there was not as much to be said against it as in favour of it. To alter it now would mean too radical an alteration of the scale altogether.

3536. I think I understood you to say you did not like the plan of penalising teachers?—I think a somewhat wrong impression has been given by the term penalising, or fining; as I have set it down, you give what is called a bonus for the certificate. There is another way of doing it, and that is to start with a certain certificate and a certain salary, the salary rising with the certificate; or you can give different salaries for different certificates, as the Wellington Board does, only with a smaller range of differences than the Wellington scale. I introduced this plan of mine because it is financially sounder—you know what the maximum is. If you give bonuses for certificates above the lowest you do not know what the maximum will be; it is very uncertain. A bonus system is uncertain because it may add on so much to the minimum amount that is to be paid, that at last it becomes cumbrous.

3537. Is it necessary in a colonial scale of staff and salaries to insist upon a certificate at all—I mean, to insist upon a certain certificate, not that teachers should be uncertificated?—I do not think it is necessary in the sense that it is essential. If it were necessary I should not drop it out of my scale at all, even in scale D.

3538. Then, it is not essential?—No; of course, there are arguments on both sides, and very strong ones.

3539. You are, of course, aware that the English Education Department, in regulation No. 64, says "there is only one class of certificate, but distinction is made as regards the right to superintend pupil-teachers." Formerly certificated teachers were graded, but these grades are now non-existent, and officially all certificated teachers are of the same professional standing. In 1861 there were no less than twelve grades of teachers; in 1870 the number was reduced to eight; in 1881 the number was further reduced to five; and in 1900 all these grades were abolished?—Since 1890 there were three classes; I have not seen the 1900 Code. The question is not settled in England yet; an amendment is to be proposed by certain members in Sir John Gorst's Registration Bill, which is said to have a majority of the House of Commons, to introduce two classes in the registration.

3540. The Education Department I look upon as a "fountain of honour," and is it necessary to require more from a teacher than evidence that he holds from the department a qualifying certificate or diploma?—I do not think the term "necessary" is right; the question is which of the two courses is desirable; you have to weigh all the arguments for and against. I think it is desirable, but not absolutely essential.

3541. In scale C, regulation (*b*) says "at least three out of the first six assistants in any school above 510 (exclusive of mistress) must be female assistants"; counting the mistress, that will be seven assistants: does this scale allow Education Boards, or School Committees with the permission of Education Boards, to vary the staffing?—Yes; but it prevents them from putting the mistresses down to the lowest salaries; the Auckland Board puts all its mistresses at the bottom of the salary scale.

3542. This will prevent that?—Yes.

3543. In this scale the first mistress will get £180?—Yes.

3544. And the first assistant master £245?—Yes.

3545. Would an Education Board have the right to say that the next teacher on that staff, a master, must get a salary of £150?—Yes; the second assistant.

3546. Would it be competent for that same Board, instead of saying they would have a second assistant as master, to say they would give a mistress £125?—Yes.

3547. Then, the fourth assistant in that school would receive £135?—Yes, whether it was a male or a female.

3548. There would be equality there?—Yes; you must allow it somewhere, so as to allow Boards a certain degree of liberty in staffing schools.

3549. Is £150 the highest possible salary you can give an assistant master in that position, with an average of 690 in attendance?—You could give him a salary of £195.

3550. If you eliminate a pupil-teacher?—No, if you substitute a pupil-teacher for a junior assistant.

3551. *Mr. Davidson.*] If you drop one pupil-teacher out of the staff of that school, I understand the salary of the second master would be £185?—Yes, that is so; that is the effect of note (*e*).

3552. *Mr. Hill.*] Would you allow, for example, £20 out of the £35 available for the pupil-teacher to be added to the assistant's salary, and £15 to either of the other teachers on the staff?—No, I should not; I have thought that out.

3553. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do I understand that, in order to get a much more skilled, experienced, and efficient second male assistant in the school, you propose, where it is thought necessary, to drop a pupil-teacher and give such a salary as will secure a teacher possessed of the qualifications I mention?—Yes; instead of having to teach 50 he would very likely have to teach 80, and would need to be a much stronger man.

3554. *Mr. Weston.*] Do I understand that the Board would have power to take either a male or a female teacher?—I think that would be left open.

3555. They are not bound to take either a male or a female?—No; the total cost has been calculated on the most expensive hypothesis, subject to the fact that there are not enough male teachers in the colony to go round.

3556. *Mr. Hill.*] With regard to the salaries of pupil-teachers, I see you suggest an extra allowance to pupil-teachers if obliged to live away from home?—Yes.

3557. A fourth-year pupil-teacher will probably be a young man twenty years of age?—It depends on the district.

3558. You propose to give him £50 a year, and if he is compelled by order of the Board to live away from home you only make him an extra allowance of £5?—That is above the average paid in the colony now.

3559. I am speaking of pupil-teachers. I would suggest that greater allowances should be made to them. I have a boy between fifteen and sixteen years of age—he is at school at the present time—and he has been offered a situation a dozen times in a place in Napier at £1 a week, and he has no experience whatever. It seems to me that full consideration should be given to pupil-teachers if we are to get the best material: do you not think so?—You have to consider the salaries paid at the present time not only to pupil-teachers, but to teachers generally; if you add the money to the salaries of the pupil-teachers you take it away from the teachers.

3560. Could not an alteration be made in the allowances to pupil-teachers who may be required by the Boards to go to another district and live away from home?—If I had the money I would do so; but the assistants should have still higher salaries than in this scale if I had the money to enable it to be done. It is only right that the low salary should come to the pupil-teachers; they are learning their profession, and they have enough to live on.

3561. Do you consider £55 a living-wage?—A boy can live on it, though it is about all he can do. The £1 a week you quote is a very unusual amount to offer a boy of fifteen or sixteen years of age when beginning work. I have had experience in three towns in the colony, and I consider 5s. to 10s. a week is the average wage offered under such conditions.

3562. *Mr. Davidson.*] With regard to the staffing in schools up to an average attendance of 90, I have the staffing of the Southland, Otago, South Canterbury, North Canterbury, and various other educational districts in New Zealand; I have the staffing of such schools in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, and South Australia: can you say whether or not the staffing proposed by you is more liberal or less liberal than the staffing in the districts I have just named?—It is not more liberal than Canterbury; it is the same.

3563. It is as liberal as Canterbury?—Yes.

3564. And more liberal than in any of the other districts in New Zealand, or in any of the Australian States I have mentioned?—Yes; I think the staffing in the Australian Colonies is the weak point in the system.

3565. It is more liberal than Southland or Otago?—Yes; up to 110 Southland has no pupil-teacher, only a master and a mistress.

3566. Southland does not admit the third teacher so soon?—Not till an attendance of 110 is reached.

3567. You propose to admit such a teacher at 90 in attendance?—Yes.

3568. Then, the staffing is very much more liberal than Southland?—Yes.

3569. All round, the staffing in your suggested scale is a very great improvement?—Yes.

EXHIBITS.

EXHIBIT No. 2.

NEW ZEALAND EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

COLONIAL SCALE OF STAFF AND SALARIES, A.

THE accompanying scale of staff and salaries deals with the distribution of the main portion of the vote for primary education—namely, the capitation on average attendance. For the purposes of this calculation a capitation grant of £4 has been assumed. The present statutory grant is £3 15s. per head; without the increase of 5s. per head the suggested scale would be impossible.

The total amount of the capitation grant at £4 would be, on the average attendance for the year ended 31st December, 1899, £441,263.

Out of the capitation grant are payable all teachers' salaries and allowances, and the general expenses of Education Boards and of School Committees.

At present the capitation grant is payable to each Board on the average attendance at the schools in its district. The introduction of a colonial scale of staff and salaries necessarily, therefore, involves the question of the finance of the Boards. A very brief examination of the question shows that the capitation basis of payments to Boards is unworkable in conjunction with a colonial scale: for instance, in the smallest district, Westland, the total of salaries and allowances under the scale exceeds the total amount of the capitation grant, even at the increased rate of £4 per head; and in other small districts, and in large districts where the population is sparse and small schools are numerous, after paying teachers' salaries and allowances according to the scale, the balance available for the general expenses of the Boards and Committees would be too small to meet the legitimate claims made upon it, if the capitation basis of payments to Boards were retained.

In drawing up the scheme an endeavour has been made, among other things,—

1. To improve the efficiency of the schools by increasing and strengthening the staff.

2. To give such salaries as will attract good teachers, or, at all events, prevent the best teachers from going into other professions.

3. To remove inequalities and anomalies in salaries paid in various positions—*e.g.*, to increase generally the salaries paid to women, especially to women holding responsible positions.

4. Consistently with the above, to leave as much discretion as possible to Boards in the management of the schools and of their finances, and to increase the balance at their disposal after satisfying the demands already referred to.

STAFF.

It is obvious that it is practically impossible to have a uniform scale of salaries without a uniform scale of staff.

In the thirteen districts there are thirteen systems of staffing schools, although some of these systems have more or less resemblance to one another. Objection may be taken to them on the following grounds:—

(*a.*) In eight districts the first increase of staff takes the form of the addition of a pupil-teacher. This has only cheapness to recommend it: in a school with seven or eight classes there is very little opportunity for the head-teacher to supervise and direct a young pupil-teacher.

The proposed scale gives an assistant teacher when the average attendance at a school reaches 36.

(*b.*) The number of pupil-teachers in proportion to adult teachers is too large for real efficiency. The proportion is 2,593 adults to 1,022 pupil-teachers, or one pupil-teacher for 2·54 adult teachers; the proposed scale of staff gives 2,999 adult teachers to 778 pupil-teachers, or one pupil-teacher for 3·85 adults. The difference may be stated roughly as follows: The existing scales give 51 adults for each 20 pupil-teachers; the proposed scale gives 77 adults for each 20 pupil-teachers.

Or, if we exclude schools under 20, there are at present 2,175 adults to 1,022 pupil-teachers, or one pupil-teacher for every 2·12 adult teachers; the proposal would give in the schools of 20 and upwards 2,581 adults to 778 pupil-teachers, or one pupil-teacher for every 3·32 adult teachers. Roughly, under existing circumstances, there are for every 24 pupil-teachers 51 adults; according to the proposed scale there would be 80 adults.

(*c.*) The number of pupils intrusted to each teacher is too large for much individual attention.

Taking all schools, the average number per teacher is 30·5; and in schools of 20 and upwards, 32·7. The proposed scale shows a substantial improvement, and the staff suggested, although it may still be regarded as inadequate, is as strong as in the best staffed districts of the colony, and better than in any of the Australian Colonies—slightly better even than in South Australia, which is far ahead of all the others in this respect. Unfortunately, the money available will not suffice to provide an ideal staff. The average number of pupils per teacher, as proposed, will be, for all schools, 29·2; and in schools of 20 and upwards, 31·1.

(*d.*) The proportion of pupil-teachers in large schools in some districts is too high. According to the proposed scale, the number of adult teachers is always in excess of the number of pupil-teachers.

The total staff for all schools under proposed and existing scales is as follows:—

—	Head or Sole Teachers.	Assistants.	Total Adult Teachers (exclusive of Sewing-mistresses).	Pupil-teachers.
Existing staff (December, 1899)	1,645	896	2,541	1,022
Proposed staff	1,645	1,354	2,999	778

SALARIES.

There is greater difference between the various districts in this respect even than in respect of the staffing. The following table shows some of the anomalies, corresponding salaries in certain other colonies, and the proposed salaries for the posts named:—

Head or Sole Teacher.

—	Average Attendance, Schools over 20.				Average Salary.
	20	100	250	600	
Present scales—	£	£	£	£	
New Zealand ... from	70	160	203	258	£149 11s. 9d.
New Zealand ... to	115	225	275	375	
Victoria	75	130	157	201	
New South Wales ...	88	130	185	350	
Queensland	100	210	270	342	
South Australia ...	110	240	315	420	
New Zealand, proposed ...	120	189	254	324	£160 11s. 0d.

Infant-mistress, or First Assistant Mistress.

	Small Schools. Commencing Salaries.			Large Schools. Highest Salaries paid to Infant-mistress or First Assistant Mistress.		
Present scales—	£			£	s.	d.
New Zealand ... from	42	...	...	100	0	0
New Zealand ... to	85	...	...	166	13	4
New South Wales ...	72	Infant-mistress ...		194	0	0
		Girls' Dept. ...		250	0	0
South Australia	84	...	...	148	0	0
New Zealand, proposed ...	80	...	...	200	0	0

First Male Assistant.

	Small Schools. Commencing Salaries.			Large Schools.		
Present scales—	£			£	s.	d.
New Zealand ... from	90	...	...	175	0	0
New Zealand ... to	160	...	...	265	15	0
New South Wales	72	...	...	225	0	0
South Australia	100	...	...	200	0	0
New Zealand, proposed	150	...	...	250	0	0

Pupil-teachers: Salaries and Allowances.

	£	s.	d.
Present, average	31	6	10
Proposed, average ... ... {salary alone	35	0	0
{or with allowances	36	0	0

All Teachers except Sewing-mistresses.

Average salary and allowances—	£	s.	d.
Present scale (except house-allowance)	96	14	3
Proposed scale (except house-allowance)	100	12	0

House-allowance.

Another difficulty is the question of house-allowances to head-teachers. Three hundred and fifty-one schools with average attendance over 20 have no residences attached: 113 of these are in the Auckland District, 65 in Wellington, 38 in Wanganui, 29 in Hawke's Bay, &c. The salaries, although nominally equal, would still be unequal if no account were taken of this fact. To deal with this question on a sound basis would involve interference with the discretion of Boards in building residences. In fact, although the matter of house-allowances cannot be overlooked in dealing with the question of teachers' salaries, yet it is so closely connected with the treatment of the building-votes that it would appear better to deal with it as a separate matter, say, next year, when the distribution of the building-votes is to be reconsidered. The increase of the balance at the disposal of Boards after payment of salaries will enable them to deal, at all events, with cases in which hardship might otherwise be occasioned by the absence of house-allowance.

Fees for Instruction of Pupil-teachers.

The proposed scale does not contemplate the payment of fees for the instruction of pupil-teachers. It would, of course, be open to any Board to make such payments in addition to salaries if it were thought expedient to do so.

General Expenses of Boards.

These include allowances to School Committees, office salaries and other office expenses, Inspectors' salaries and allowances, members' expenses, cost of training teachers, examinations, manual and technical instruction, and sundries.

The cost of manual and technical instruction, as far as the Boards are concerned, will be entirely met (or nearly so) out of the funds provided for carrying out the new Manual and Technical Instruction Act. The grant for the training of teachers has also been increased from £600 to £1,000. To provide for the other expenses of the Boards, it is proposed to distribute the balance left after the payment of teachers' salaries and allowances, by giving £250 to each Board, and 11s. 3d. per head on the average attendance. For this purpose the £4,000 subsidy for inspection is merged in the general fund. This will give the Boards £65,303, or considerably more than they are able to apply to the same purposes now.

District High Schools.

A separate vote has been taken for district high schools, which will be distributed according to a separate scheme, and will be available for increasing salaries and for meeting other expenses of such schools.

Transition from the Old System to the New.

A short Bill amending "The Education Act, 1877," would be necessary to authorise the proposed method of distributing the total statutory grant, and to increase the rate to £4. There would be a period of transition as regards the staffing of schools and payment of teachers, as the scale increases the number of adult teachers and decreases the number of pupil-teachers, raises some salaries and lowers a few others. The difficulties, though great, appear by no means insuperable, the manner in which the change should be made would form a very suitable subject for discussion at the conference that it is proposed to hold early next year.

Method of Payment.

All the payments would be made, it is suggested, to the Boards as now, distribution according to the scale being left in the hands of the Boards.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, although the addition of 5s. to the capitation allowance would not enable the smaller Boards to raise their salaries to what may be regarded as reasonable rates, or to cope with other financial difficulties, it may be justly claimed that the proposed scheme enables the Government, with that addition, to improve the staffing of the schools, to increase, generally speaking, the salaries of teachers, and to give to the Boards a balance available for their general expenses much larger than, after paying salaries and Committees' allowances, has been at their disposal before.

Appended is a financial summary, based on the "working average" for December quarter, 1899, and showing the distribution of the £4 capitation; and a similar summary based on the existing scales payable in the several districts for the same quarter.

ACCORDING TO PROPOSED SCALE.

1. Salaries—	Average Attendance.			£
Schools under	15	...	Capitation at £5 ...	11,770
"	15–19	...	Sole teachers ...	13,812
"	20–35	...	" ...	59,277
" over	35	...	Head-teachers ...	137,718
" "	35	...	Assistants ...	129,375
" "	75	...	Pupil-teachers ...	28,008
	Net total salaries		...	£379,960
2. Balance to Boards, for office and general expenses, excluding scholarships, buildings, &c. (some Boards also receive subsidies for training of teachers, £1,000 in all, in addition to district-high-school fees and other miscellaneous receipts = £1,500 at least), £250 to each Board, and capitation at 11s. 3d.			...	65,303
	Total		...	£445,263

Contra:—

Capitation, 110,315·75, at £4 ...	£441,263
Inspection subsidy ...	4,000
Total ...	£445,263

ACCORDING TO PRESENT SCALES.—ESTIMATED FROM BOARDS' RETURNS.

	£
Teachers' salaries and allowances ...	357,711
Balance available for Boards' general expenses ...	59,973
Total ...	£417,684

Contra:—

Capitation at £3 15s. ...	£413,684
Inspection subsidy ...	4,000
Total ...	£417,684

December, 1900.

G. HOGBEN,
Inspector-General of Schools

PROPOSED COLONIAL SCALE OF STAFF AND SALARIES.

Average Attendance.	Head or Sole Teacher. Salary. Male. Fixed.	Male. Capitation.*	Female. Fixed Minimum	Female. Capitation.*	Certificate.	Infant-mistress.	Certificate.	Head of Boys' or Girls' Department. M.	Head of Boys' or Girls' Department. F.	Certificate.	First Assistant. M.	First Assistant. F.	Certificate.	Second Assistant. M.	Second Assistant. F.	Third Assistant. M.	Third Assistant. F.	Fourth Assistant. M.	Fourth Assistant. F.	Fifth Assistant. M.	Fifth Assistant. F.	Sixth Assistant. M.	Sixth Assistant. F.	Seventh Assistant. M.	Seventh Assistant. F.	Eighth Assistant. M.	Eighth Assistant. F.	Ninth Assistant. M.	Ninth Assistant. F.	Tenth Assistant. M.	Tenth Assistant. F.	Number of Pupil-teachers.	Salaries of Pupil-teachers.‡
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.		£		£	£		£	£		£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£		
Over 14 and not over 19	75 100 0	75 100 0	E5																													
„ 19 „ 35	118† 40 0	102 40 0	E2																													
„ 35 „ 75	150 12 0	134 6 0	D2	..	..	..	..	..	80	80	D4																					
„ 75 „ 100	174 12 0	146 6 0	D1	..	..	..	..	..	90	85	D3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	
„ 100 „ 150	189 12 0	153½ 6 0	„	..	..	..	..	..	100	90	„	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	
„ 150 „ 175	219 8 0	168½ 6 0	„	..	..	..	..	..	110	95	„	90	85	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	
„ 175 „ 225	229 8 0	176 4 0	„	..	..	..	..	..	120	100	„	90	85	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	
„ 225 „ 250	249 8 0	186 4 0	„	..	..	..	..	..	130	105	„	100	90	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	
„ 250 „ 300	259 6 0	191 4 0	C1	105	D2	..	..	..	150	105	D3	100	90	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	
„ 300 „ 330	274 6 0	201 4 0	„	110	„	..	..	..	160	110	„	110	95	90	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	
„ 330 „ 390	283 4 0	207 4 0	„	120	„	..	..	..	170	120	„	115	100	90	80	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	
„ 390 „ 420	295 4 0	219 4 0	„	130	„	..	..	..	180	130	„	120	105	100	85	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5	
„ 420 „ 480	301 4 0	225 4 0	„	140	„	..	..	..	190	140	„	125	110	100	85	80	80	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5	
„ 480 „ 510	313 4 0	237 4 0	„	150	„	..	..	..	200	150	„	130	115	110	90	90	80	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6	
„ 510 „ 570	319 4 0	243 4 0	„	160	„	..	..	..	210	160	„	135	120	110	90	90	80	80	80	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6	
„ 570 „ 600	331 4 0	255 4 0	„	170	„	..	..	..	220	170	„	140	125	120	95	100	85	90	80	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7	
„ 600 „ 660	337 4 0	261 4 0	B1	170	D1	220	170	B2	220	170	D3	150	110	120	95	100	85	90	80	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7	
„ 660 „ 690	349 4 0	273 4 0	„	180	„	230	180	„	230	180	„	150	115	130	100	110	90	100	90	90	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8	
„ 690 „ 750	355 2 0	279 2 0	„	180	„	230	180	„	230	180	„	160	115	130	100	110	90	100	90	90	80	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8	
„ 750 „ 780	361 2 0	&c. 2 0	„	180	„	230	180	„	230	180	„	160	120	140	110	120	100	100	90	90	80	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	9	
„ 780 „ 840	364 2 0	2 0	„	190	„	240	190	„	240	190	„	170	120	140	110	120	100	110	100	100	90	80	80	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	9	
„ 840 „ 870	370 2 0	2 0	„	190	„	240	190	„	240	190	„	170	130	150	120	130	110	110	100	100	90	90	80	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	10	
„ 870 „ 930	373 2 0	2 0	„	200	„	250	200	„	250	200	„	170	130	150	120	130	110	110	100	100	90	90	80	80	80	80	80	..	..	..	..	10	
„ 930 „ 960	379 2 0	2 0	„	200	„	250	200	„	250	200	„	180	140	160	130	140	120	120	110	110	100	100	90	90	80	80	80	..	..	..	..	11	
„ 960 „ 1020	382 2 0	2 0	„	200	„	250	200	„	250	200	„	180	140	160	130	140	120	120	110	110	100	100	90	90	80	80	80	80	80	..	..	11	
„ 1020 „ 1050	388 2 0	2 0	„	200	„	250	200	„	250	200	„	180	140	160	130	140	120	120	110	110	100	100	90	90	80	80	80	80	80	..	..	12	

First year, £20, with allowance of £10 if obliged to live away from home.
Second year, £30, „ „ „ „ „
Third year, £40, £5 „ „
Fourth year, £50, £5 „ „

Aided schools, 1–14; capitation at £5.

* Capitation is payable on the number in excess of the lower of the two numbers in the column "Average Attendance": for instance, the salary in a school of 15 is £80; in a school of 25, £130 or £114, &c.
† The teacher, if a master, shall give £10 per annum for a sewing-mistress; if he be married, his wife shall be preferred, provided that in the opinion of the Board she is qualified to teach sewing.
‡ A fifth-year pupil-teacher if uncertificated and continuing in the same school shall receive the remuneration of a third-year pupil-teacher, but otherwise he shall be paid as a fourth-year pupil-teacher.

N.B.—The salary allotted to any position in the above scale to be subject to a deduction of 1 per cent. for each class and 4 per cent. for each division of the teacher's certificate below the class and division of the certificate assigned to that position. The rule to apply to all schools with average attendance of 15 and upwards.

In mixed schools from 36 to 250 in average attendance, if the head-teacher be a master, the first assistant must be a mistress, and *vice versâ*. In mixed schools from 251 to 600 the assistant masters must not occur oftener than in every alternate position—*e.g.*, first, third, fifth assistants, or second, fourth, sixth assistants. In schools from 601 upwards there may be, besides the infant-mistress, two heads of departments or two first assistants instead of one head of department and one first assistant; one of them must be a master, and the other a mistress. The salaries are not affected by the change of name; in these schools male assistants must not occur oftener than in every alternate position, beginning with that of the second assistant—*e.g.*, second, fourth, sixth, &c., or third, fifth, seventh, &c. The number of female adult teachers in any mixed school must not be less than the number of male adult teachers.

In estimating salaries two half-time schools count as one school, the average attendances being added together.

Teachers' Certificates.—The salaries of the scale are for teachers holding certificates not lower than those named below. Deductions will be made from the salaries shown in Table I. of 1 per cent. for each class below that assigned, and of 4 per cent. for each division below that assigned. A deduction of 20 per cent. will be made in cases of teachers holding no certificate. Licenses will count as E5. Those who have satisfied the literary requirements for a certificate, but have not yet obtained certificates, will be paid, for the first two years only, as if holding a certificate of the 5th division in the class for which they have qualified; after such two years they will be considered merely as uncertificated teachers.

Examples.—A head-teacher in a school of 120 with an E2 certificate—*i.e.*, one class and one division below the class and division assigned—will have 5 per cent. deducted from his salary; his actual net salary will therefore be £201 – £10 1s. = £190 19s. An infant-mistress in a school of 675, holding an E3 certificate, will lose 9 per cent.—*i.e.*, her net salary will be £161 4s.; and so on.

These deductions do not apply to schools with an average attendance under 15.

December, 1900. G. HOGBEN.

EXHIBIT No. 3.

ASSISTANTS: SCHOOLS, 250 TO 600.

(Salaries of head-teachers as for separate schools.)

—	*Boys' Schools.* 1st A.M.	2nd A.M.	3rd A.M.	4th A.M.	5th A.M.	6th A.M.	7th A.M.	No. of P.T.'s.	*Girls' or Infants' Schools.* 1st A.F.	2nd A.F.	3rd A.F.	4th A.F.	5th A.F.	6th A.F.	7th A.F.	No. of P.T.'s.
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£		£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
251–300	200	155	125	100	..	..	..	3	150	115	100	80	..	..	..	..
300–330	205	160	125	100	..	..	..	4	155	120	105	85	..	..	..	4
330–390	210	160	130	105	80	..	..	4	160	120	110	90	80	..	..	4
390–420	215	165	130	105	80	..	..	5	165	125	110	95	80	..	..	5
420–480	220	165	135	110	90	80	..	5	170	125	115	95	85	80	..	5
480–510	225	170	135	110	90	80	..	6	175	130	115	100	85	80	..	6
510–570	230	170	140	115	100	90	80	6	180	130	120	100	90	85	80	6
570–600	235	175	140	115	100	90	80	7	185	135	120	105	90	85	80	7

EXHIBIT No. 8.

SCHOOLS WITH AVERAGE ATTENDANCE OVER 20, WITHOUT RESIDENCES. (1899—LATEST RETURN.)

Auckland	113	Westland	5
Taranaki	17	North Canterbury	18
Wanganui	38	South Canterbury	11
Wellington	65	Otago	3
Hawke's Bay	29	Southland	19
Marlborough	2		
Nelson	22		351
Grey	9		

EXHIBIT No. 10.

EXPENSES OF EDUCATION BOARDS.

Districts.	1898.	1899.	1900.	Average of Three Years.
	£	£	£	£
Auckland	13,339	12,346	12,720	12,802
Taranaki	2,181	2,239	2,449	2,290
Wanganui	3,877	3,945	3,904	3,909
Wellington	6,853	7,080	6,479	6,804
Hawke's Bay	4,093	4,084	3,906	4,028
Marlborough	1,108	1,097	1,181	1,129
Nelson	3,586	3,547	3,477	3,536
Grey	769	743	803	772
Westland	712	692	723	709
North Canterbury	10,133	10,120	9,738	9,997
South Canterbury	2,617	2,560	2,814	2,663
Otago	9,703	9,590	8,709	9,334
Southland	3,966	4,330	4,246	4,180
Totals	62,937	62,373	61,149	62,153

EXHIBIT No. 50.

PROPOSED COLONIAL SCALE (B) OF STAFF AND SALARIES.

Suggested Alternative Scheme for Schools with 15 to 330 in average attendance.

Average Attendance.	Head or Sole Teacher: Salary.				Infant Mistress.	Remarks.
	Male.		Female.			
	Fixed.	Capitation.	Fixed.	Capitation.		
	£	s.	£	s.	£	
Over 14 and not over 19	75	100	75	100	...	
" 19 " 40	118	40	102	40	...	
" 40 " 65	160	20	144	10	90	
" 65 " 90	185	20	156½	10	100	
" 90 " 120	210	10	169	5	105	Also one pupil-teacher.
" 120 " 150	225	8	176½	4	110	Also two pupil-teachers.
" 150 " 200	237	6	182½	3	115	Also one assistant and two pupil-teachers.
" 200 " 250	252	4	190	2	120	Also two assistants and two pupil-teachers.
" 250 " 275	262	4	195	2	125	Also two assistants and three pupil-teachers.
" 275 " 330	267	4	197½	2	130	Also three assistants and three pupil-teachers.

15th May, 1901. G. HOGBEN.

EXHIBIT No. 60.

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF STAFFS.

(Presented by Mr. P. Goyen.)

(N.B.—Column 2 shows the numbers being taught by the teachers during the Inspector's visit of inspection.)

Otago Staffing.				Proposed Staffing.	
Class.	No. of Pupils.	Teacher.	Salary.	Teacher.	Salary.
		School with Average Attendance of 590.			
			£		£
VII.	6	Head-teacher†	326	Head-teacher‡	335
VI.	72	Male assistant†	240	Male assistant‡	220
V.	92	" †	180	" ‡	120
IV.	76	" †	115	" ‡	90
III.	79	Female assistant† ...	110	Female assistant‡ ...	125
II.	67	" † ...	85	" ‡ ...	85
I.	67	" † ...	85	" ‡ ...	80
P.	160	Mistress and 2 pupil-teachers	155	Mistress and 4 pupil-teachers	170
		School with Average Attendance of 526.			
VII.	24	Head-teacher†	324	Head-teacher†	322
VI.	43	Male assistant†	240	Male assistant†	210
V.	58	" †	175	" †	110
IV.	70	" †	112	" †	80
III.	63	Female assistant† ...	110	Female assistant† ...	120
II.	80	" † ...	85	" † ...	80
I.	63	2 pupil-teachers	...	" † ...	80
P.	150	Mistress and 2 pupil-teachers	150	Mistress and 4 pupil-teachers	160
		School with Average Attendance of 430.			
VII.	6	Head-teacher	299	Male assistant*	303
VI.	28	Male assist. & 1 pupil-teacher	210	" *	190
V.	51				100
IV.	61	Male assistant	150	" *	80
III.	58	Female assistant	95	Female assistant* ...	110
II.	51	"	85	" * ...	80
I.	48	Head-teacher	...	Head-teacher & pupil-teacher	...
P.	147	Mistress and 2 pupil-teachers	135	Mistress and 3 pupil-teachers	140

* One pupil-teacher to assist in these classes. † Two pupil-teachers assisting in these classes.
‡ Three pupil-teachers to assist in these classes.

EXHIBIT No. 60—*continued.*

Otago Staffing.				Proposed Staffing.	
Class.	No. of Pupils.	Teacher.	Salary.	Teacher.	Salary.
		School with Average Attendance of 353.			
VII.	12	Head-teacher	285	Head-teacher	288
VI.	35	Male assistant	200	Male assist. & 1 pupil-teacher	170
V.	45				
IV.	45	"	110	Male assistant ...	90
III.	49	Female assistant	105	Female "	100
II.	56	"	105	" "	80
I.	46	Head-teacher & pupil-teacher	...	Head-teacher & 1 pupil-tchr.	...
P.	87	Mistress and 1 "	130	Mistress and 2 pupil-teachers	120
		School with Average Attendance of 272.			
VII.	4	Head-teacher	265	Head-teacher	263
VI.	18	Male assistant	175	Male assistant	150
V.	21				
IV.	35	Head-teacher	...	"	80
III.	25	Female assistant	85	Female assis. & pupil-teacher	80
II.	20	"	85		
I.	28	Mistress and pupil-teacher...	120	Head-teacher "	...
P.	66			Mistress "	105
		School with Average Attendance of 203.			
VII.	8				
VI.	14	Head-teacher	249	Head-teacher*	240
V.	28				
IV.	30				
III.	28	Female assistant	85	Male assistant*	90
II.	26	Head-teacher & pupil-teacher	...	Female " *	80
I.	18				
P.	59	Mistress "	115	Mistress and 1 pupil-teacher	100
		School with Average Attendance of 169.			
VII.	1				
VI.	11	Head-teacher	235	Head-teacher*	227
V.	14				
IV.	22				
III.	24				
II.	31	Female assistant	35	Male assistant*	90
I.	36				
P.	27	Mistress	108	Mistress and pupil-teacher...	95

* One pupil-teacher to assist in these classes.

EXHIBIT No. 92.

STATEMENT ABSTRACTED FROM THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD REPORT FOR 1898.
(Mr. C. Watson, B.A.)

AVERAGE attendance in boys' departments, 133,257; average attendance in girls' departments, 125,534; average attendance in mixed departments, 23,632; average attendance in infant departments, 147,430: total, 429,853.

Number of boys' departments, 417; number of girls' departments, 412; number of mixed departments, 77; number of infant departments, 445: total, 1,346.

Average number of boys in a department, 320; average number of girls in a department, 305; average number in mixed department, 328; average number in infant department, 331.

Thus, in London, every assistant man or woman has a reasonable chance of rising to a fair position. For, approximately, out of every ten men teachers one is getting a salary of £320 or over; out of every ten women one receives a salary of £200 or over.

Expenditure per child in average attendance in 1898 (exclusive of buildings and sites), £3 19s. 11d.; expenditure on sites and buildings per child in average attendance in 1898, £1 3s. 11d. (in 1897 the expenditure under this head was greater): total expenditure per child (1898) in average attendance, £5 3s. 10d.

London schools are buildings to accommodate on the average about 1,100 children. But these are almost universally divided into a boys' department, a girls' department, an infant department—each under independent management.

Salaries and Staffs.

Beethoven Street School (mixed school).—Average, 659. Staff: One head-teacher and thirteen assistants. Salaries: Head-teacher, £400; one assistant at £165, two assistants at £155, one assistant at £151, one assistant at £145, two assistants at £130, one assistant at £125, one assistant at £115, two assistants at £112, two assistants at £106.

Kilburn Lane School.—Average boys' department, 511. Staff: One head-teacher, nine assistants, and two pupil-teachers. Salaries: Head-teacher, £400; one assistant at £165, one assistant at £155, one assistant at £150, one assistant at £145, one assistant at £125, two assistants at £121, one assistant at £105, one assistant at £95.

Halford Road School.—Boys' department, average, 438. Staff: One head-teacher, eight assistants, and two pupil-teachers. Salaries: Head-teacher, £330; three assistants at £155, one assistant at £140, one assistant at £125, three assistants at £120.

Harwood Road School.—Boys' department, average, 328. Staff: One head-teacher and six assistants. Salaries: Head-teacher, £358; five assistants at £155, one assistant at £115. NOTE.—This head-teacher's salary is higher than the general salary. It is one of a number of "commuted" salaries. But I thought it advisable to take these salaries as they come on the return. As a matter of fact, I find that nearly every boys' department of 300 (or about) in average attendance has a head-teacher with one of these commuted salaries.

Hugon Road School.—Boys' department, average, 240. Staff: One head-teacher, six assistants, and two pupil-teachers. Salaries: Head-teacher, £280 16s. 8d.; one assistant at £131, two assistants at £120, one assistant at £115, two assistants at £105.

EXHIBIT No. 97.

RANGE OF SALARIES IN THE SEVERAL DISTRICTS.

District.	20–30.	30–50.	50–70.	70–100.	100–200.	200–300.	300–400.	400–500.	500–600.	Over 600.
	£ £	£ £	£ £	£ £	£ £	£ £	£ £	£ £	£ £	£ £
Auckland	100–135	135–160	160–175	175–200	200–230	240–260	291–311	330–342	354–357	378–408
Females ..	100–108	108	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Taranaki	88–111	113–134	136–157	158–165	..	202	231	263	..	..
Females ..	75–103	91–110	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Wanganui ..	97–150	130–174	152–196	168–209	204–261	249	251–300	..	..	..
Females ..	74–119	93–142	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Wellington ..	110–165	120–235	195–225	205–260	235–290	275–295	..	345–370	345–370	355–360
Females ..	100–145	100–152	..	..	..	..	..	264	..	..
Hawke's Bay ..	110–156	135–178	153–167	181–207	184–222	284–288	300	347	365	481
Females ..	102–133	138–168	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Marlborough ..	123	170	144–147	..	180–210	264	..	..	..	..
Females ..	90–110	..	130	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Nelson	100	110–150	145–200	160–175	180–300	300	..	300	..	..
Females ..	80–96	96–112	..	100	100–180	175	..	..	..	..
Grey	..	127	142–165	..	..	220	..	250	..	..
Females ..	88	88–112	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Westland	..	130	134	159–162	..	293	..	..	..	..
Females ..	90–106	85–117	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
North Canterbury ..	101–139	127–164	155–170	169–200	193–283	251–262	289–363	320–380	..	365–431
Females ..	100–139	141–150	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
South Canterbury ..	112–142	130–156	141–148	153–163	175–201	213	258–306	380*	259	..
Females ..	101–129	117–120	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Otago	85–150	140–170	170–191	191–215	215–247	259–357*	271–313	295–364	310–370	340–416
Females ..	85–100	105	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Southland ..	115–143	136–152	154–163	165–175	184–216	223–246	..	..	291	309
Females ..	92–124	121–132	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Range	88–165	110–235	134–225	153–260	175–290	202–300	231–363	250–380	259–370	..
Females ..	74–145	85–168	130	100	100–180	175	..	..	..	..

* District high school.

EXHIBIT No. 100.

SUGGESTED SCHEME SHOWING CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOLS AND GRADES OF TEACHERS, WITH EMOLUMENTS FOR EACH CLASS OF SCHOOL AND GRADE OF TEACHERS.

1. Teachers are classed as:—(*a*) Probationers or pupil-teachers; (*b*) junior assistants; (*c*) assistants; (*d*) principal or head-teachers.
2. (*a.*) A probationer is a teacher in training under a certificated assistant and a principal teacher.
   (*b.*) A junior assistant is a teacher who has held a certificate of competency by examination from the Department for a period less than two years, but is not qualified to take charge of a public school.
   (*c.*) An assistant is a teacher holding a full certificate of competency for a longer period than two years, and is qualified to take sole charge of a public school.
   (*d.*) A principal teacher is one who has charge of a public school and holds a certificate of competency from the Education Department.

3. Schools are arranged in ten classes, according to average attendance, as follows:—
   (*a.*) 10th or lowest class, schools with an average attendance not exceeding 20.
   (*b.*) 9th class, schools with average over 20 and not exceeding 30.
   (*c.*) 8th class, " 30 " 45.
   (*d.*) 7th class, " 45 " 75.
   (*e.*) 6th class, " 75 " 110.
   (*f.*) 5th class, " 110 " 175.
   (*g.*) 4th class, " 175 " 300.
   (*h.*) 3rd class, " 300 " 520.
   (*i.*) 2nd class, " 520 " 620.
   (*j.*) 1st class, " 620
4. (*a.*) Table I. shows the proposed staffing of schools.
   (*b.*) Table II. shows the emoluments of head or principal teachers for each class of school, with proposed capitation increase from a minimum to a maximum in each class.
   (*c.*) Table III. contains the proposed emoluments of assistants, both male and female, with proposed capitation increase from a minimum to a maximum. The proposed rate of capitation increase between minimum and maximum is subject to arrangement.
   (*d.*) Table IV. contains the proposed emoluments of junior assistants and probationers.

Table I.—Showing the Proposed Staffing of Schools in New Zealand.

Average Attendance.	Principal Teacher.	Assistants.									Junior Assistants.	Total certificated.	Probationers.*	Total Staffing in Terms, Probationers or Pupil-teachers.	Remarks.
		Males.				Females.									
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5					
Below 30 ..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	2	Mistress preferred.
Over 30 to 45..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	2	Master preferred unless school has grown under mistress.
" 45 " 75..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	2	..	4	
" 75 " 110..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	2	1	5	
" 110 " 140..	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	2	2	6	
" 140 " 175..	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1	3	2	8	A junior assistant male or female may be appointed in place of two pupil-teachers if desired by a Committee.
" 175 " 235..	1	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1	4	2	10	
" 235 " 270..	1	1	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	4	3	11	
" 270 " 300..	1	1	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	4	4	12	
" 300 " 350..	1	1	1	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	5	4	14	
350 " 400..	1	1	1	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	1	6	4	16	
400 " 430..	1	1	1	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	1	6	5	17	
" 430 " 480..	1	1	1	..	..	1	1	1	..	..	1	7	5	19	
" 480 " 520..	1	1	1	..	..	1	1	1	1	..	1	8	5	11	
520 " 580..	1	1	1	1	..	1	1	1	1	..	1	9	5	23	
" 580 " 620..	1	1	1	1	..	1	1	1	1	..	1	9	5	24	
" 620 " 670..	1	1	1	1	..	1	1	1	1	1†	1	10	6	26	
" 670 " 700..	1	1	1	1	..	1	1	1	1	1†	1	10	7	27	

* Two probationers are deemed equal to one assistant. † May be fourth assistant male, or fifth assistant female.

Over 700 the staffing increases by one junior assistant for every 40 in average attendance, or one pupil-teacher for every 30, and so on alternately as may become necessary.

Table II.—Classification of Schools and Emoluments of Teachers in each Class.

10th Class.—All schools in which the average does not exceed 20. Emolument: from £5 to £100, or £5 capitation for each pupil.

9th Class.—Schools over 20 and not more than 30 in average attendance. Salary: from £100 to £130, or £100 + £3 capitation for every increase over 20.

8th Class.—Schools over 30 and not more than 45 in average attendance. Salary: from £130 to £160, or £130 + £2 capitation for every increase over 30.

7th Class.—Schools over 45 and not more than 75 in average attendance. Salary: from £160 to £175, or £160 + 10s. capitation for every increase over 45.

6th Class.—Schools over 75 and not more than 110 in average attendance. Salary: from £175 to £188 2s. 6d., or £175 + 7s. 6d. capitation for every increase over 75.

5th Class.—Schools over 110 and not more than 175 in average attendance. Salary: from £188 2s. 6d. to £212 10s., or £188 2s. 6d. + 7s. 6d. capitation for every increase over 110.

4th Class.—Schools over 175 and not exceeding 300 in average attendance. Salary: from £212 10s. to £259 7s. 6d., or £212 10s. + 7s. 6d. capitation for every increase over 175.

3rd Class.—Schools over 300 and not exceeding 520 in average attendance. Salary: from £259 7s. 6d. to £325 7s. 6d., or £259 7s. 6d. + 6s. capitation for every increase over 300.

2nd Class.—Schools over 520 and not exceeding 620 in average attendance. Salary: from £325 7s. 6d. to £345 7s. 6d., or £325 7s. 6d. + 4s. capitation for every increase over 520.

1st Class.—Schools over 620 and not exceeding 700 in average attendance. Salary: from £345 7s. 6d. to £353 7s. 6d., or £345 7s. 6d. + 2s. capitation for every increase over 620.

No salary allowance in the way of capitation is made to any teacher in a school beyond 700 in average attendance.

These salaries are exclusive of house-allowance. When no house is provided for a principal teacher the following allowances will be made in lieu of house: Principal teachers in schools below the 3rd class, 20 per cent. of the amount of salary payable; principal teachers in schools of the 3rd, 2nd, and 1st classes, 15 per cent. of the amount of salary payable.

Table III.—Assistants.

(NOTE.—The salary of assistants is the same as the salary of principal teachers in schools of a lower class.)

(*a.*) FEMALES.

1st Assistant.—From 110 to 700 in average attendance. The salary varies from the highest salary paid to a teacher of the 9th class of school and with an average attendance of 25, to the highest salary paid to a principal teacher in a school of the 6th class—viz., from £115 over 110 average to £188 2s. 6d. at 700 in average attendance.

2nd Assistant.—School where the average is 235. The salary varies from the highest salary paid to a teacher in a school of the 10th class to the highest salary paid to a principal teacher in a school of the 7th class—viz., from £100 over 235 in average to £175 at 700 in average attendance.

3rd Assistant.—School where the average reaches 430. The salary varies from the highest amount payable to a teacher in a school of the 10th class and with an average attendance of 18, to the highest salary paid to a head-teacher in a school of the 9th class—viz., from £90 at 430 average to £130 at 700 average.

4th Assistant.—School where the average reaches 480. The salary varies from the highest amount paid to a teacher in a school of the 10th class and with an average attendance of 18, to the highest salary paid to a head-teacher in a school of the 9th class—viz., from £90 at 480 average to £130 at 700 average.

5th Assistant.—School where the average reaches 620. The salary varies from the highest amount paid to a teacher in a school of the 10th class and with an average attendance of 18, to the highest salary paid to a teacher in a school of the 9th class and with an average attendance of 24—viz., from £90 at 620 average to £112 at 700 average.

(*b.*) MALES.

1st Assistant.—The salary varies from the highest salary paid to a principal teacher in a school of the 9th class to the highest salary paid to a principal teacher in a school of the 4th class—viz., from £130 above 175 average to £259 7s. 6d. at 700 average.

2nd Assistant.—The salary varies from the highest salary paid to a principal teacher in a school of the 9th class to the highest salary paid to a principal teacher in a school of the 5th class—viz., from £130 above 300 average to £212 10s. at 700 average.

3rd Assistant.—The salary varies from the highest salary of a principal teacher in a school of the 10th class to the highest salary paid to a teacher in a school of the 7th class—viz., from £100 above 520 average to £175 at 700 average.

4th Assistant.—See 5th assistant female, and note under tabulation showing staffing.

Table IV.—Emoluments of Junior Assistants and Probationers.

1. Probationers or pupil teachers (male and female) :—
   (*a.*) First year: The salary will be £20 per annum, with £15 additional if required to live in a district away from home.
   (*b.*) Second year: £30 per annum, with £15 additional as above.
   (*c.*) Third year: £40 per annum, with £15 additional as above.
   (*d.*) Fourth year: £50 per year, with £15 additional as above.

Special facilities will be given to enable probationers to pursue their studies with a view to their qualifying themselves as certificated teachers.

A special bonus of £10 will also be given to every pupil-teacher on the completion of his or her full term of service, and who obtains a certificate of competency from the Education Department at the first examination following the termination of his or her engagement.

2. Junior Assistants :—

Junior assistants are employed in schools of the 7th and 8th classes, and in such other schools as their services may be required under the staffing regulations.

The salary of a junior assistant shall be £90 or £100 per annum according to the year of service as junior assistant.

25th June, 1901. H. HILL.

EXHIBIT No. 106.

EXPERIENCE OF TEACHERS PROMOTED IN JUNE, 1901.

Education Districts.	Division 1.		Division 2.		Division 3.		Division 4.	
	Average Years.	Number of Teachers.	Average Years.	Number of Teachers.	Average Years.	Number of Teachers.	Average Years.	Number of Teachers.
Auckland	14·32	14	9·59	37	5·51	41	5	3
Taranaki	15·33	3	12	3	7·16	6	5 2	5
Wanganui	19·5	2	12·33	6	18·5	2	6 5	8
Wellington	13·9	10	9·63	11	7 06	14	3·66	3
Hawke's Bay	15	1	9	2	9 14	7	6·5	6
Marlborough	22	1	8	2	4·5	2	..	..
Nelson	11	3	9·14	7	5 66	3	4	2
Grey	14·5	2	10·66	3	6·5	2	..	..
Westland	..	..	..	..	6	1	..	..
North Canterbury	20·33	3	11·76	13	9 5	22	6·66	9
South Canterbury	20	2	11·66	6	6·87	8	5·5	2
Otago	19·55	15	12·76	13	8·07	14	3	1
Southland	17·75	4	10·85	7	8·16	12	4·2	5
Means for colony	16·93	..	10·61	..	7·89	..	5·02	..

CLASSES OF CERTIFICATES IN EACH DISTRICT, JUNE, 1901 (NOT INCLUDING INSPECTORS).

Education District.	1901.						1886.					
	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	Total.		B.	C.	D.	E.	Total.
Auckland	3	11	13	277	304	608	2	8	11	73	189	283
Taranaki	3	1	5	32	33	74	..	1	2	4	15	22
Wanganui	4	3	13	74	101	195	..	1	7	12	48	68
Wellington	1	12	18	131	94	256	1	5	3	33	47	89
Hawke's Bay	..	10	5	48	62	125	..	2	2	16	26	46
Marlborough	..	1	2	20	18	41	..	..	..	4	14	18
Nelson	2	6	5	58	56	127	..	..	1	12	36	49
Grey	..	1	1	15	25	42	..	1	..	1	8	10
Westland	..	2	2	15	10	29	..	..	2	1	16	19
North Canterbury ..	5	22	41	237	77	382	3	12	28	89	136	268
South Canterbury ..	1	8	2	67	37	115	2	2	4	11	28	47
Otago	5	27	37	277	74	420	1	11	32	104	167	315
Southland	1	13	11	93	90	208	..	3	3	23	39	68
Totals	25	117	155	1,344	981	2,622	9	46	95	383	769	1,302
Percentage for colony ..	0·95	4·46	5·91	51·25	37·41		0·69	3·52	7·29	29·41	59·06	..

ASSISTANTS IN DIVISION I., 1899.

Education District.	A1.	B1.	C1.	D1.	E1.
Auckland	...	1	...	7	1
Taranaki	...	...	...	...	1
Wanganui	...	...	...	...	3
Wellington	...	1	1	6	1
Hawke's Bay	...	...	2	1	1
Marlborough	...	...	...	...	...
Nelson	...	...	...	2	...
Grey	...	1	...	...	3
Westland	...	...	...	2	1
North Canterbury	...	...	1	3	1
South Canterbury	...	...	...	...	...
Otago	1	1	2	4	2
Southland	...	1	...	1	...

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CHARGE OF CLASSIFIED HEAD-TEACHERS, DECEMBER, 1899.

Education District.	A1.		B1.		C1.		D1.		E1.	
	Children.	Teachers.	Children.	Teachers.	Children.	Teachers.	Children.	Teachers.	Children.	Teachers.
Auckland	...	...	417	4	208	5	191	62	82	17
Taranaki	...	...	173	1	202	3	92	6	41	3
Wanganui	...	...	245	2	202	4	191	12	91	7
Wellington	...	...	228	6	140	8	181	28	76	14
Hawke's Bay	...	...	248	3	150	1	264	11	137	6
Marlborough	...	...	...	...	110	2	88	8	31	1
Nelson	...	...	258	1	73	3	79	10	74	11
Grey	...	...	...	...	...	...	146	6	31	4
Westland	...	...	258	1	83	1	109	4	46	1
North Canterbury ...	857	1	515	6	254	11	181	23	83	6
South Canterbury ...	...	...	340	4	30	1	119	4	48	2
Otago	358	2	300	7	255	13	218	26	59	5
Southland	...	...	165	4	328	2	134	17	64	8

EXHIBIT No. 107.

Proposed Colonial Scale of Staff and Salaries.—Scheme C.

Average Attendance.	Head or Sole Teacher.						Mistress.		Assistants.																		Pupil-teachers.
	Male.			Female.																							
	Fixed.	Capitation.*	Certificate.	Fixed.	Capitation.*	Certificate.																					
	£	s.		£	s.		£		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Over 14 and not over 19	75	100	E4	75	100	E4	..		£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
„ 19 „ 40	118	40	E3	102	40	E3	..																				
„ 40 „ 50	160	20	D2	144	20	D2	80	D4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
„ 50 „ 70	170	20	„	149	10	„	85	„	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
„ 70 „ 90	190	25	„	159	10	„	100	„	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
„ 90 „ 120	215	10	D1	169	5	D1	105	„	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
„ 120 „ 150	230	8	„	176½	5	„	110	„	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
„ 150 „ 200	242	6	„	184	4	„	115	„	85	85	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
„ 200 „ 250	257	6	„	194	4	„	120	„	160	130	85	85	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
„ 250 „ 275	272	4	C1	204	4	C1	125	D2	175	140	90	90	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
„ 275 „ 330	277	4	„	209	4	„	130	„	190	150	105	105	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
„ 330 „ 390	288	4	„	220	5	„	135	„	200	160	110	110	105	105	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
„ 390 „ 420	300	4	„	232	4	„	140	„	210	170	115	110	105	105	90	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
„ 420 „ 480	306	4	„	238	4	„	145	„	225	180	125	115	110	110	105	105	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
„ 480 „ 510	318	4	„	&c.	4	„	150	„	240	190	130	115	115	115	110	110	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
„ 510 „ 570	324	4	„	..	4	„	155	„	240	190	135	120	115	115	115	110	110	100	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
„ 570 „ 600	336	4	„	..	&c.	„	160	„	240	190	135	120	120	120	115	110	110	100	85	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
„ 600 „ 660	342	4	B1	..	..	B1	170	C2	240	190	135	120	125	125	120	115	115	105	90	85	80	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
„ 660 „ 690	354	2	„	..	2	„	180	„	245	195	150	125	135	135	125	120	120	115	95	90	85	85	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
„ 690 „ 750	357	2	„	..	&c.	„	190	„	245	195	160	130	145	145	130	125	125	120	100	95	95	90	80	80	..	..	..	..	7
„ 750 „ 780	363	2	„	..	..	„	200	„	245	195	170	135	155	155	135	130	130	125	110	100	100	95	80	80	..	..	..	..	8
„ 780 „ 840	366	2	„	..	..	„	210	„	250	200	170	135	160	160	135	130	130	125	110	100	100	95	85	85	80	80	..	..	8
„ 840 „ 870	372	2	„	..	..	„	210	„	250	200	170	135	160	160	135	130	130	125	110	100	100	95	85	85	80	80	..	..	9
„ 870 „ 930	375	2	„	..	..	„	210	„	250	200	170	135	160	160	140	135	135	130	115	105	105	100	90	90	85	85	80	80	9
„ 930 „ 960	375	2	„	..	..	„	210	„	250	200	175	140	160	160	140	135	135	130	115	105	105	100	90	90	85	85	80	80	10
„ 960 „ 1020	375	2	„	..	..	„	210	„	250	200	175	140	160	160	140	135	135	130	115	105	105	100	90	90	90	90	85	85	10
„ 1020 „ 1050	375	2	„	..	..	„	210	„	250	200	175	140	160	160	140	135	135	130	115	105	105	100	90	90	90	90	85	85	11

Aided schools, 1–14; capitation at £5.

* Capitation is payable on the number in excess of the lower of the two numbers in the column "Average Attendance": for instance, the salary in a school of 15 is £80; in a school of 25, £130 or £144, &c.

Salaries of Pupil-teachers.

First year, £20, with allowance of £10 if obliged to live away from home.
Second „ £30, „ £10
Third year, £40, with allowance of £5 if obliged to live away from home.
Fourth „ £50, „ £5 „

(*a.*) The number of male assistants must not exceed the number of female assistants (including the mistress).
(*b.*) At least three out of the first six assistants in any school above 510 (exclusive of the mistress) must be female assistants.
(*c.*) An assistant at £80 may be substituted for two pupil-teachers; or *vice versâ*.
(*d.*) Instead of an assistant, a pupil-teacher may be employed, £45 being added to the salary of another assistant.
(*e.*) Instead of adding a pupil-teacher, a Board may add £35 to the salary of an assistant.
(*f.*) Only one of these changes (*c*), (*d*), and (*e*) will be allowed in schools not over 420, and only two in schools over 420.
(*g.*) The total number of pupil-teachers in any education district must not be increased by such changes as (*c*), (*d*), and (*e*) above the number allowed for such district by the scale.

N.B.—The salary allotted to any position in the above scale is subject to a deduction of 1 per cent. for each class, and 4 per cent. for each division of the teacher's certificate below the class and division of the certificate assigned to that position; but no salary shall thereby be reduced to less than £80.

27th June, 1901. George Hogben.

Note.—As I find that the total amount for teachers' salaries and for allowances to Boards under this scale is still far within the limit of a £4 capitation, when the whole year is taken into account, I should like to amend Scale C by raising the minimum salary of £80 in all cases to £85—viz., in the case of the mistress in schools of 40 to 50, and of the last assistant in schools above 275; also, to raise the salary of the mistress in schools of 50 to 70 from £85 to £90.

29th June, 1901. G. H.

EXHIBIT No. 110.

Proposed Colonial Scale of Staffs and Salaries.—Scheme D.

Average Attendance.	Head or Sole Teacher.				Mistress.	Assistants.																						No. of Pupil-teachers.
	Male.		Female.																									
	Fixed.	Capitation.*	Fixed.	Capitation.*																								
	£	s.	£	s.	£	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Over 14 and not over 19	75	100	75	100	..	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
„ 19 „ 40	118	40	102	40	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
„ 40 „ 50	160	20	144	10	90	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
„ 50 „ 70	170	30	149	10	95	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
„ 70 „ 90	200	20	159	10	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
„ 90 „ 120	220	10	169	5	105	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
„ 120 „ 170	235	6	176½	5	110	90	90	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
„ 170 „ 200	250	6	189	4	115	90	90	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
„ 200 „ 250	259	6	195	4	120	160	130	120	90	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
„ 250 „ 275	274	4	205	4	125	175	140	130	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
„ 275 „ 330	279	4	210	4	130	190	150	140	105	100	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
„ 330 „ 390	290	4	221	4	135	200	160	150	110	105	105	100	90	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
„ 390 „ 420	302	4	233	4	140	210	170	160	115	110	105	100	90	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
„ 420 „ 480	308	4	239	4	145	225	180	170	120	120	110	110	105	100	90	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
„ 480 „ 510	320	4	&c.	4	150	240	190	175	125	120	115	115	110	100	90	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
„ 510 „ 570	326	4	..	4	155	240	190	180	130	130	115	120	110	110	100	100	90	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
„ 570 „ 600	338	4	..	&c.	160	240	190	180	130	140	120	125	115	110	100	100	90	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
„ 600 „ 660	344	4	..	..	170	250	200	180	130	150	125	130	120	115	105	105	95	95	90	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
„ 660 „ 690	356	2	..	2	180	250	200	190	140	160	135	130	120	120	115	110	100	100	95	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
„ 690 „ 750	359	2	..	&c.	190	250	200	190	150	165	145	135	125	125	120	115	105	105	100	95	90	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
„ 750 „ 780	365	2	..	..	200	250	200	195	155	170	155	140	130	130	125	115	105	105	100	100	95	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8
„ 780 „ 840	368	2	..	..	210	250	200	195	155	175	160	140	130	130	125	115	105	110	105	105	100	90	90	..	..	..	..	..	8
„ 840 „ 870	375	..	..	..	210	260	200	200	160	175	160	150	135	130	125	120	110	110	105	105	100	90	90	..	..	..	..	..	9
„ 870 „ 930	375	..	..	..	210	260	200	200	160	175	160	150	135	135	130	120	115	115	110	110	105	95	90	90	90	..	..	..	9
„ 930 „ 960	375	..	..	..	210	260	200	200	160	175	160	150	135	135	130	120	115	115	110	110	105	100	95	90	90	..	..	..	10
„ 960 „ 1020	375	..	..	..	210	260	200	200	160	175	160	150	135	135	130	120	115	115	110	110	105	105	100	100	100	90	90	..	10
„ 1020 „ 1050	375	..	..	..	210	260	200	200	160	175	160	150	135	135	130	120	115	115	110	110	105	105	100	100	100	90	90	11	

Aided schools, 1–14; capitation at £5.

* Capitation is payable on the number in excess of the lower of the two numbers in the column "Average Attendance": for instance, the salary in a school of 15 is £80; in a school of 25, £130 or £114, &c.

Salaries of Pupil-teachers.

First year, £25, with allowance of £15 if obliged to live away from home.
Second „ £30, „ £15 „
Third year, £40, with allowance of £10 if obliged to live away from home.
Fourth „ £50, „ £10 „

A fifth-year pupil-teacher continuing in the same school shall receive the remuneration of a third-year pupil-teacher; but otherwise, or if he has passed the examination for a teacher's certificate, he shall receive the salary of a fourth-year pupil-teacher.

(*a.*) The number of male assistants must not exceed the number of female assistants (including the mistress).

(*b.*) At least three out of the first six assistants in any school above 510 (exclusive of the mistress) must be female assistants.

(*c.*) An assistant at £90 may be substituted for two pupil-teachers, or *vice versâ*.

(*d.*) Instead of an assistant a pupil-teacher may be employed, £45 being added to the salary of another assistant.

(*e.*) Instead of adding a pupil-teacher, a Board may add £45 to the salary of an assistant.

(*f.*) Only one of these changes (*c*), (*d*), and (*e*) will be allowed in schools not over 420, and only two in schools over 420.

(*g.*) The total number of pupil-teachers in any Education District must not be increased by such changes as (*c*), (*d*), and (*e*) above the number allowed for such district by the scale.

N.B.—It is not proposed under this scheme to make any deductions on account of low certificates.

27th June, 1901.

George Hogben.

EXHIBIT No. 116.

CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOLS FOR SCHEMES C AND D.

[Taken from school returns for December Quarter, 1900.]

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN EACH DISTRICT ACCORDING TO WORKING AVERAGES.

Working Averages, Dec., 1900.	Auckland.	Taranaki.	Wanganui.	Wellington.	Hawke's Bay.	Marlborough.	Nelson.	Grey.	Westland.	North Canterbury.	South Canterbury.	Otago.	Southland.	Totals.
1 to 9	5	4	5	14	1	39	24	8	14	7	..	7	1	129
10 „ 14	29	4	9	9	7	4	15	5	5	15	4	25	6	137
15 „ 19	53	7	11	17	7	3	19	1	7	22	6	24	14	191
20 „ 40	144	26	57	48	20	8	34	7	2	68	30	71	67	582
41 „ 50	21	10	13	7	11	3	9	2	3	23	7	16	15	140
51 „ 70	36	3	17	15	4	2	8	2	1	10	9	26	12	145
71 „ 90	8	5	6	6	7	..	6	3	2	17	4	14	9	87
91 „ 120	16	2	7	6	6	2	3	..	..	11	1	8	7	69
121 „ 150	7	..	6	6	3	2	1	..	..	4	..	4	2	35
151 „ 170	5	1	..	2	2	1	1	..	..	2	1	2	..	17
171 „ 200	5	1	1	2	2	..	..	..	..	3	1	1	4	20
201 „ 250	7	..	4	3	1	..	1	1	2	4	1	5	2	31
251 „ 275	1	..	2	1	2	..	1	..	..	1	..	1	..	9
276 „ 330	..	..	1	..	1	1	1	..	..	1	1	3	1	10
331 „ 390	3	1	3	2	..	..	..	..	..	2	1	3	..	15
391 „ 420	..	..	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	2	1	1	..	6
421 „ 480	3	1	..	2	..	..	..	1	..	4	..	2	..	13
481 „ 510	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	2	..	6
511 „ 570	6	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	12
571 „ 600	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	2
601 „ 660	5	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	1	10
661 „ 690	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	2
691 „ 750	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
751 „ 780	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	2
781 „ 840	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	2
841 „ 870	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
871 „ 930	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
931 „ 960	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1
961 „ 1020	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1
1021 „ 1050	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Totals ..	354*	65	143†	147	77	65	124	30	36	201†	68	222	142‡	1,674

* This includes 54 half-time schools, which are reckoned as 27. † This includes 2 half-time schools, which are reckoned as 1. ‡ This includes 8 half-time schools, which are reckoned as 4.

AGGREGATE OF WORKING AVERAGES FOR DECEMBER QUARTER, 1900, FOR SCHEMES C AND D.

Working Averages.	Auckland.	Taranaki.	Wanganui.	Wellington.	Hawke's Bay.	Marlborough.	Nelson.	Grey.	Westland.	North Canterbury.	South Canterbury.	Otago.	Southland.	Totals.
1 to 9	32	28	34	83	8	224	120	56	81	55	..	52	9	782
10 „ 14	355	49	107	116	91	48	173	61	62	189	47	311	72	1,681
15 „ 19	897	117	196	285	114	50	325	16	122	376	100	402	236	3,236
20 „ 40	4,100	753	1,659	1,405	588	238	974	199	61	1,883	875	2,110	1,874	16,719
41 „ 50	935	449	595	308	505	139	398	92	137	1,046	303	711	670	6,288
51 „ 70	2,117	178	986	887	230	122	455	114	54	599	510	1,539	728	8,519
71 „ 90	644	402	454	498	545	..	461	243	161	1,353	326	1,086	745	6,918
91 „ 120	1,691	215	714	619	660	218	318	..	..	1,139	110	844	765	7,293
121 „ 150	939	..	786	788	425	283	143	..	..	560	..	543	270	4,737
151 „ 170	774	154	..	327	319	151	156	..	..	312	158	317	..	2,668
171 „ 200	897	174	192	382	348	..	..	..	..	546	186	195	751	3,671
201 „ 250	1,530	..	819	652	221	..	220	202	461	872	204	1,154	416	6,751
251 „ 275	263	..	516	255	537	..	251	..	..	256	..	270	..	2,348
276 „ 330	..	..	317	..	319	311	285	..	..	284	315	909	285	3,025
331 „ 390	1,116	339	1,093	725	..	..	..	..	..	693	333	1,103	..	5,402
391 „ 420	..	..	406	..	..	..	403	..	..	832	420	410	..	2,471
421 „ 480	1,336	466	..	921	..	..	..	472	..	1,772	..	850	..	5,817
481 „ 510	..	..	..	1,473	..	..	..	..	..	495	..	1,009	..	2,977
511 „ 570	3,195	..	..	532	551	..	..	..	..	..	..	2,084	..	6,362
571 „ 600	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	588	580	1,168
601 „ 660	3,147	..	..	630	626	..	..	..	..	..	624	628	627	6,282
661 „ 690	..	..	..	674	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	680	..	1,354
691 „ 750	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
751 „ 780	..	..	..	..	755	..	..	..	..	759	..	..	..	1,514
781 „ 840	..	..	..	786	..	..	..	..	..	807	..	..	..	1,593
841 „ 870	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
871 „ 930	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
931 „ 960	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	941	..	..	..	941
961 „ 1020	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	981	..	..	..	981
1021 „ 1050	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Totals ..	23,968	3,324	8,874	12,346	6,842	1,784	4,682	1,455	1,139	16,750	4,511	17,795	8,028	111,498

EXHIBIT No. 117.

CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOLS FOR MR. HILL'S SCHEME (EXHIBIT 100).

[Taken from school returns for December Quarter, 1900.]

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN EACH DISTRICT ACCORDING TO WORKING AVERAGES.

1. NUMBER of SCHOOLS in each Grade.

Working Averages, Dec., 1900.	Auckland.	Taranaki.	Wanganui.	Wellington.	Hawke's Bay.	Marlborough.	Nelson.	Grey.	Westland.	North Canterbury.	South Canterbury.	Otago.	Southland.	Totals.
1 to 20	97	17	27	42	18	46	61	14	26	46	10	60	23	487
21 „ 30	80	15	30	28	7	4	18	4	1	45	18	31	40	321
31 „ 45	66	14	30	24	15	5	19	4	2	32	18	46	35	310
46 „ 75	47	9	29	16	13	4	14	4	3	28	11	35	18	231
76 „ 110	18	6	7	10	7	1	4	2	2	19	4	17	11	108
111 „ 140	8	..	8	7	4	2	2	..	..	5	..	4	5	45
141 „ 175	9	2	..	3	6	2	2	..	..	5	1	4	1	35
176 „ 235	10	..	5	5	1	..	1	1	2	6	2	3	6	42
236 „ 270	2	..	2	1	1	..	1	..	..	1	..	4	..	12
271 „ 300	..	..	1	..	1	..	1	..	..	1	..	2	1	7
301 „ 350	1	1	1	1	1	1	..	..	..	1	2	1	..	10
351 „ 400	2	..	2	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	3	..	9
401 „ 430	..	..	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	3	1	3	..	9
431 „ 480	3	1	..	2	..	..	..	1	..	3	..	..	..	10
481 „ 520	2	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	4	..	10
521 „ 580	4	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	1	9
581 „ 620	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	4
621 „ 670	2	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	1	7
671 „ 700	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	2
Over 700	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	6
Totals ..	354*	65	143†	147	77	65	124	30	36	201†	68	222	142‡	1,674

* This includes 54 half-time schools, reckoned as 27. † This includes 2 half-time schools, reckoned as 1. ‡ This includes 8 half-time schools, reckoned as 4.

2. NUMBER of SCHOOLS in each Class.

Working Average, Dec. 1900.	Auckland	Taranaki.	Wanganui.	Wellington.	Hawke's Bay.	Marlborough.	Nelson.	Grey.	Westland.	North Canterbury.	South Canterbury.	Otago.	Southland.	Totals.
1 to 20	97	17	27	42	18	46	61	14	26	46	10	60	23	487
21 „ 30	80	15	30	28	7	4	18	4	1	45	18	31	40	321
31 „ 45	66	14	30	24	15	5	19	4	2	32	18	46	35	310
46 „ 75	47	9	29	16	13	4	14	4	3	28	11	35	18	231
76 „ 110	18	6	7	10	7	1	4	2	2	19	4	17	11	108
111 „ 175	17	2	8	10	10	4	4	..	..	10	1	8	6	80
176 „ 300	12	..	8	6	3	..	3	1	2	8	2	9	7	61
301 „ 520	8	2	4	7	1	1	1	1	..	9	3	11	..	48
521 „ 620	7	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	1	13
621 & over	2	..	..	3	2	..	..	..	..	4	1	2	1	15
Totals ..	354*	65	143	147	77	65	124	30	36	201†	68	222	142‡	1,674

* This includes 54 half-time schools, reckoned as 27. † This includes 2 half-time schools, reckoned as 1. ‡ This includes 8 half-time schools, reckoned as 4.

EXHIBIT No. 118.

SUPPLEMENTARY SCALE (UNDER SCALE C) FOR SEPARATE BOYS', GIRLS', AND INFANT SCHOOLS (SCHOOLS 201–600).

	* Boys' Schools.								* Girls' Schools.								* Infant Schools.							
	Assistants.							P.Ts.	Assistants.							P.Ts.	Head-teacher.	Assistants.						P.Ts.
201–250	190	150	120	..	..	..	..	2	140	110	90	..	..	..	..	2	165	125	90	85	..	..	..	..	2
251–280	200	155	125	..	..	..	..	3	150	115	100	..	..	..	..	3	175	130	90	85	..	..	..	..	3
281–330	205	160	125	100	..	..	..	3	155	120	105	85	..	..	..	3	180	140	100	90	85	..	..	..	3
331–390	210	160	130	105	85	..	..	3	160	120	110	90	85	..	..	3	185	145	110	100	90	85	..	..	3
391–420	215	165	130	105	85	..	..	4	165	125	110	95	85	..	..	4	190	150	115	105	95	85	..	..	4
421–480	220	165	135	110	90	85	..	4	170	125	115	95	85	85	..	4	195	150	115	105	95	90	85	..	4
481–510	225	170	135	110	90	85	..	5	175	130	115	100	85	85	..	5	200	155	120	110	100	95	85	..	5
511–570	230	170	140	115	100	90	85	5	180	130	120	100	90	85	85	5	205	155	120	110	100	95	90	85	5
571–600	235	175	140	115	100	90	85	6	185	135	120	105	90	85	85	6	210	160	125	115	105	100	95	85	6

* Salary for Head-teachers as under Scale C.

19th July, 1901.

G. HOGBEN.

WITNESSES EXAMINED.

WELLINGTON. Page

Monday, 22nd April, to Thursday, 25th April, 1901.

G. Hogben, M.A., Secretary for Education and Inspector-General of Schools 1

BLENHEIM.

Saturday, 27th April.

Capt. Baillie, M.L.C., Acting-Chairman, Marlborough Education Board 17
R. McCallum, member, Marlborough Education Board 21
F. Birch, Chairman, Blenheim School Committee .. 26
Miss M. C. Williams, teacher, Marshlands 27
C. C. Howard, head-teacher, Picton school, and president of the Marlborough Educational Institute .. 28
D. A. Sturrock, headmaster, Blenheim Boys' School .. 34
G. Wilmot, teacher, Waitohi School 36
N. T. Pritchard, Chairman, Grovetown School .. 37

NELSON.

Tuesday, 30th April.

F. G. Gibbs, M.A., headmaster, Nelson Boys' School, and president of the Nelson Educational Institute .. 37
G. Talbot, Chairman, Nelson Education Board .. 41
T. Bailie, member, Nelson Education Board.. .. 45
H. Philips, member, Nelson Education Board .. 46
Stead Ellis, secretary, Nelson Education Board .. 47
G. A. Harkness, M.A., Chief Inspector, Nelson Education District 48
L. D. Easton, teacher, Lower Moutere 53
Rev. J. P. Kempthorne, Chairman, Nelson School Committee 55
Rev. J. H. McKenzie, member, Nelson School Committee 59
W. F. Worley, assistant master, Nelson Boys' School 62
F. V. Knapp, assistant master, Nelson Boys' School .. 65
Stead Ellis, evidence continued 66

GREYMOUTH.

Saturday, 4th May.

S. R. Harris, Chairman, Grey Education Board .. 66
W. R. Kettle, member, Grey Education Board .. 69
J. Petrie, member, Grey Education Board 74
W. A. Rundle, president, Grey Educational Institute.. 77
H. Smith, B.A., honorary secretary, Grey Educational Institute 78
F. W. Riemenschneider, secretary, Grey Education Board 82
A. A. Adams, headmaster, Greymouth District High School 82

HOKITIKA.

Monday, 6th May.

A. A. Adams, evidence continued 83
J. McWhirter, Chairman, Westland Education Board.. 85
J. Grimmond, member, Westland Education Board .. 91
H. L. Michel, member, Westland Education Board .. 92
A. J. Morton, B.A., Inspector of Schools and Secretary, Westland Education Board 94
H. G. Wake, B.A., headmaster, Hokitika District High School, and president, Westland Educational Institute 97
J. J. Henderson, headmaster, Arahura Road School, and honorary secretary, Westland Educational Institute 101
Miss W. J. Aitken, assistant, Hokitika District High School 104
W. D. Mackay, headmaster, Woodstock School .. 105

CHRISTCHURCH.

Friday, 10th May.

H. C. Lane, secretary, North Canterbury Education Board 106
L. B. Wood, M.A., Inspector of Schools, North Canterbury District 112

Saturday, 11th May. Page

R. J. Paull, Chairman, Richmond School Committee .. 121
W. J. Boyce, teacher, Grey Downs 123
C. D. Hardie, president, Ashburton section, North Canterbury Educational Institute 127
R. B. Ryder, president, Oxford section, North Canterbury Educational Institute 129
L. Watson, teacher, Kirwee School 134
His Honour Mr. Justice Cooper, recently member of the Auckland Education Board 136

Monday, 13th May.

E. Watkins, B.A., principal, Christchurch Normal School 140
J. R. Brunt, Chairman, East Christchurch School Committee 144
G. F. Henry, secretary, East Christchurch School Committee 144
T. Hughes, M.A., honorary secretary, North Canterbury Educational Institute 144
T. S. Foster, M.A., headmaster, West Christchurch School 147
Miss Glanville, assistant, Woolston School 150
Miss Kitchingman, headmistress, Normal School, Christchurch 152
Mrs. Wilkinson, infant mistress, Riccarton School .. 153
Miss Menzies, assistant, West Christchurch School .. 155
Mrs. Lissaman, Christchurch 156
Miss Glanville, evidence continued 159
C. D. Morris, Chairman, West Christchurch School Committee 159
F. Rowley, first assistant, West Christchurch School .. 160
H. C. Lane, evidence continued 161

DUNEDIN.

Thursday, 16th May.

G. Hogben, M.A., evidence continued 605
Rev. P. B. Fraser, M.A., member, Otago Education Board 161
J. Mitchell, member, Otago Education Board .. 169
P. G. Pryde, secretary, Otago Education Board .. 173

Friday, 17th May.

P. G. Pryde, evidence continued 178
P. Goyen, Inspector of Schools, Otago District .. 179

Saturday, 18th May.

D. R. White, M.A., principal, Normal School, Dunedin 190
W. E. Bastings, representing Oamaru Branch, Otago Educational Institute 196
W. G. Macdonald, president, Otago Educational Institute 200
Miss Hooper, representing Otago Educational Institute 207

Monday, 20th May.

Miss E. Wilkinson, representing Otago Educational Institute 209
C. Young, representing Otago Educational Institute .. 212
A. Marshall, representing Otago Educational Institute 214
C. G. Smeaton, representing assistant masters .. 218
J. Reid, B.A., representing assistant masters.. .. 221
H. Harroway, Chairman, Otago Education Board .. 224
A. Davidson, representing Otago Educational Institute 227
W. S. Fitzgerald, Inspector of Schools, Otago District 228
P. Goyen, evidence continued 233
D. R. White, evidence continued 233

INVERCARGILL.

Wednesday, 22nd May.

J. Cowie, Chairman, Southland Education Board .. 234
J. Neill, secretary, Southland Education Board .. 235
W. H. Clark, B.A., honorary secretary, Southland Educational Institute 242
G. R. George, member, Southland Education Board .. 250

Thursday, 23rd May. Page

J. Hendry, B.A., Inspector of Schools, Southland District 253
W. McAllister, member, Southland Education Board .. 258
Miss J. B. Hamilton, assistant, Nightcaps School .. 263
W. G. Mehaffey, headmaster, Middle School, Invercargill 264
A. Clark, assistant, Winton School 268
C. W. G. Selby, representing assistant teachers .. 269
J. Porteous, M.A., assistant, South School, Invercargill 272

TIMARU.

Monday, 27th May.

A. Bell, M.A., assistant secretary and assistant inspector, South Canterbury District 272
W. B. Howell, Chairman, South Canterbury Education Board 278
Rev. G. Barclay, member, South Canterbury Education Board 280
J. G. Gow, M.A., Inspector of Schools, South Canterbury District 285
J. A. Johnson, M.A., president, South Canterbury Educational Institute 289

Tuesday, 28th May.

J. A. Valentine, B.A., secretary, South Canterbury Educational Institute 293
J. P. Kalaugher, teacher, Seadown School 296
M. McLeod, B.A., head-teacher, Temuka School .. 298
Rev. G. Barclay, evidence continued .. ..

AUCKLAND.

Saturday, 1st June.

T. U. Wells, president of the Auckland Educational Institute 300
F. Brown, representing first assistant masters .. 306
J. D. McNaughton, representing teachers of the Pukekohe district 307
J. Armstrong, representing headmasters, Auckland .. 309
A. Taylor, representing medium-sized schools .. 316
Miss Shrewsbury, M.A., representing assistant mistresses 319

Monday, 3rd June.

W. R. C. Walker, representing first assistant masters 321
H. Campbell, barrister, Auckland 328
W. N. McIntosh, headmaster, Onehunga School .. 330
G. Squirrell, Chairman, Auckland School Committee .. 333
Miss Newman, representing infant mistresses .. 336
G. Large, teacher, Waiuku 338
Vincent E. Rice, secretary, Auckland Education Board 340

Tuesday, 4th June.

L. J. Bagnall, Chairman, Auckland Education Board .. 350
D. Petrie, M.A., Chief Inspector of Schools, Auckland District 362
R. Hobbs, ex-Chairman, Auckland Education Board .. 362
O. Mays, Chairman, Devonport School Committee .. 363

NEW PLYMOUTH.

Thursday, 6th June.

D. McAllum, Chairman, Taranaki Education Board .. 363
G. W. Potts, representing the Taranaki Educational Institute 367
W. E. Spencer, M.A., B.Sc., Inspector of Schools, Taranaki District 370

Friday, 7th June.

P. S. Whitcombe, secretary, Taranaki Education Board 378
H. Allsworth, member of the Taranaki Education Board 380
H. Dempsey, representing the Taranaki Educational Institute 384

WANGANUI.

Monday, 10th June.

G. S. Bridge, Chairman, Wanganui Education Board 386
Dr. J. Smyth, Chief Inspector of Schools, Wanganui District 391

Tuesday, 11th June. Page

Dr. J. Smyth, evidence continued 396
G. Grant, representing teachers of the Palmerston North District 398
J. Aitken, B.A., representing the Wanganui Educational Institute 413
J. K. Law, representing the Wanganui Educational Institute 415
G. H. Espiner, representing country schools of the Palmerston North District 417
A. A. Browne, secretary, Wanganui Education Board 419

NAPIER.

Thursday, 13th June.

Rev. Dr. D. Sidey, Chairman, Hawke's Bay Education Board 420
T. Tanner, member of the Hawke's Bay Education Board 425
G. T. Fannin, secretary, Hawke's Bay Education Board 433
Miss J. C. Brown, mistress, Napier Main School .. 434
Miss Ferguson, assistant, Taradale School 437

Friday, 14th June.

J. D. Watson, M.A., president of the Hawke's Bay Educational Institute 437
J. A. Smith, B.A., representing the Hawke's Bay Educational Institute 449
J. C. Westall, member of the Hawke's Bay Education Board 455
J. Hislop, representing assistant teachers 457
Miss Burden, head-teacher, Kumeroa School .. 459
R. B. Holmes, headmaster, Havelock North School .. 460
J. Caughley, headmaster, Kaikora North School .. 464

WELLINGTON.

Monday, 17th June.

C. Watson, B.A., representing the Wellington Educational Institute 467
A. Erskine, representing assistant masters 479
J. C. Webb, B.A., representing assistant masters .. 484
Miss Lorimer, M.A., representing the Wellington Educational Institute 486

Saturday, 22nd June.

Mrs. C. A. Francis, headmistress of the Mount Cook Infant School 491
F. Bennett, representing the Wellington Educational Institute 495
Miss Myers, assistant, Roseneath 507

Monday, 24th June.

Miss Craig, representing the Wellington Educational Institute 510
W. T. Grundy, headmaster, Clyde Quay School, Wellington 517
T. H. Gill, M.A., LL.B., secretary, New Zealand Educational Institute, and headmaster, Newtown School 527

Tuesday, 25th June.

C. R. Joplin, headmaster, Wadestown School .. 538
J. Robertson, member of the Wellington Education Board 542

Wednesday, 26th June.

J. J. Pilkington, headmaster, Porirua School .. 553

Thursday, 27th June.

J. J. Pilkington, evidence continued 564
A. Dorset, secretary, Wellington Education Board .. 569
J. R. Blair, Chairman, Wellington Education Board .. 575

Friday, 28th June.

A. Dorset, examination continued 589
T. R. Fleming, M.A., LL.B., Inspector of Schools, Wellington District 590
H. B. Kirk, M.A., Assistant Inspector of Native Schools 597
R. Lee, Chief Inspector of Schools, Wellington District 600

Saturday, 29th June.

G. Hogben, M.A., evidence continued 606

A LIST OF STATEMENTS RECEIVED.

1. Mr. F. Alley, Amberley.
2. Mr. James Smith, Milburn.
3. Mr. S. C. Owen, East Christchurch.
4. Mr. W. Winchester, Ross.
5. Mr. A. C. Maxwell, Dromore.
6. Mr. T. H. Newlyn, Christchurch.
7. Mr. W. Macandrew, Mataura.
8. Mr. A. M. Rust, Auckland District.
9. Mr. A. Bramley, Greenpark, Auckland.
10. Mr. A. W. Tindall, Blue Spur, Otago.
11. Mr. H. von Blaramberg, Palmerston North.
12. Mr. J. H. Burnard, Taieri Beach.
13. Mr. James Moir, Pukewei, Otago.
14. Mr. F. Jameson, Clevedon, Wairoa South.
15. Mr. G. W. Murray, Kaukapakapa.
16. Miss Kate Baldwin and eleven other assistant mistresses, North Canterbury.
17. Mr. H. B. Lusk, B.A., representing graduates and undergraduates, Auckland.
18. Mr. E. J. Darby, representing second and third assistants, Auckland.
19. Mr. A. Matthews, Shag Point.
20. Mr. W. Bannerman, Kyeburn.
21. Mr. J. L. Scott, Parnell.
22. Mr. D. O'Donoghue, Mount Roskill, Auckland.
23. Mr. B. Cronin, Auckland.
24. Mr. T. W. Leys, Editor *Star*, Auckland.
25. Mr. F. P. Burton, B.A., Dargaville.
26. Mr. K. Williamson, Chairman, Kokonga School Committee.
27. Mr. C. Brown, secretary, College Street School Committee Palmerston North.
28. Mr. D. L. Smart, Tuakau.
29. Mr. H. J. Howard, honorary secretary, Marlborough Educational Institute.
30. Mr. C. M. McKenzie, Hastwell.
31. Mr. A. A. Adams, Greymouth.
32. Mr. W. Rapson, Whangarata.
33. Mr. J. Taylor, Chairman, Woodville School Committee.
34. Mr. E. K. Mulgan, M.A., Inspector of Schools, Auckland.
35. Mr. F. T. Evans, assistant, Normal School, Christchurch.
36. Mr. T. Holden, Braemore, Hunterville.
37. The Secretary, Marlborough Educational Institute (through Education Board).
38. Mr. F. Neve, M.A. (for teachers of the Buller district), Westport.
39. Mr. A. W. Shrimpton, M.A., Christchurch.
40. Mr. R. B. Holmes, Havelock North.
41. Miss C. Henderson and other officers and members of the North Canterbury Women Teachers' Association.
42. Mr. W. F. Ford, Wellington.
43. Mr. N. S. Law, representing third assistants, Auckland.
44. Mr. H. H. Daniel Wily, Buckland, Auckland.
45. Mr. J. C. Mill, Long Bay and Greenhithe, half time, Auckland.
46. Mr. D. McNeil, Waihopai, Invercargill.
47. Mr. E. Cowles, Richmond Nelson.
48. Mr. J. N. Marsden, Waikiekie.
49. J. N. Dodds, B.A., Napier.

LIST OF EXHIBITS.

		Page
1.	The Commission. (See p. i.)	
2.	Scale (A) of staffs and salaries (Mr. Hogben)	617
3.	Scale relating to boys', girls', and infant schools, attached to A (Exhibit 2)	622
4.	Tables showing (*a*) the number of schools in each district according to working average; (*b*) the aggregate of working averages for December quarter, 1900 (Mr. Hogben). (Not printed.)	
5.	Financial summary, December quarter, 1900 (Mr. Hogben). (Not printed.)	
6.	A table of comparative staffing (Mr. Hogben). (Not printed.)	
7.	A table of maximum salaries of headmasters (Mr. Hogben). (Not printed.)	
8.	Schools over 20 in average attendance without residences (Mr. Hogben)	622
9.	Summary, showing the distribution of a £4 capitation according to Mr. Hogben's Scale A. (Not printed.)	
10.	Summary of Boards' expenses for the years 1898, 1899, 1900	622
11.	Regulations of the Marlborough Education Board. (Not printed.)	
12.	Inspector's report (1900), Marlborough District. (Not printed.)	
13.	Report of the Marlborough Education Board to the Hon. Minister of Education. (Not printed.)	
14.	Statement presented by J. Harre, Elton. (Not printed.)	
15.	Regulations, Nelson Education Board. (Not printed.)	
16.	Statement presented by the Nelson Educational Institute (Mr. F. Gibb). (Not printed.)	
17.	Regulations, Grey Education Board. (Not printed.)	
18.	Inspector's report (1900), Grey District. (Not printed.)	
19.	Statement of teachers, salaries, &c., for the year 1900, Grey District. (Not printed.)	
20.	Regulations, Westland Education Board. (Not printed.)	
21.	Annual reports (1900), Westland Education Board. (Not printed.)	
22.	Return of teachers, salaries, &c., March quarter, 1901, Otago District. (Not printed.)	
23.	Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, and 1900, Westland Education Board. (Not printed.)	
24.	Circular, relating to district high schools, issued by the Education Department. (Not printed.)	
25.	Statement presented by the Westland Educational Institute. (Not printed.)	
26.	Regulations (staffs and salaries), North Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)	
27.	Regulations (incidental expenses), North Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)	
28.	Regulations (pupil teachers), North Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)	
29.	Comparative statement of expenditure (1900), North Canterbury District (Mr. H. C. Lane). (Not printed.)	
30.	Annual reports (1900), North Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)	
31.	Regulations, Otago Education Board. (Not printed.)	
32.	Annual reports (1900), Otago Education Board. (Not printed.)	
33.	Regulations, Southland Education Board. (Not printed.)	
34.	Regulations (pupil teachers), Southland Education Board. (Not printed.)	
35.	Annual reports (1900), Southland Education Board. (Not printed.)	
36.	Regulations, South Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)	
37.	Regulations, Wellington Education Board. (Not printed.)	
38.	Annual reports (1900), Wellington Education Board. (Not printed.)	
39.	Regulations, Wanganui Education Board. (Not printed.)	
40.	Regulations (pupil teachers), Wanganui Education Board. (Not printed.)	
41.	Regulations, Taranaki Education Board. (Not printed.)	
42.	Regulations, Hawke's Bay Education Board. (Not printed.)	
43.	Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Nelson Education Board. (Not printed.)	
44.	Amounts payable to School Committees for incidental expenses, 1899 (Mr. Hogben). (Not printed.)	
45.	Regulations, Auckland Education Board. (Not printed.)	
46.	Statement of incidental expenses, East Christchurch School Committee (Mr. Brunt). (Not printed.)	
47.	Statement presented by North Canterbury Educational Institute (Mr. Hughes). (Not printed.)	

Page

48. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, North Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)
49. Suggested amendments to the proposed scale (Mr. L. B. Wood). (Not printed.)
50. An alternative scale (B) (Mr. Hogben) 623
51. A scale of staffs and salaries (Mr. P. B. Fraser). (Not printed.)
52. A statement of allowances to Committees, Otago District (Mr. P. G. Pryde). (Not printed.)
53. Amounts raised locally by Committees, Otago District (Mr. P. G. Pryde). (Not printed.)
54. An estimate of receipts and expenditure for the Otago District under the suggested scale. (Not printed.)
55. The report of the Committee of the Otago Educational Institute. (Not printed.)
56. Comparative statement of the salaries of first assistants (Mr. Smeaton). (Not printed.)
57. Comparison of the salaries of teachers with those of Civil servants (Mr. Reid). (Not printed.)
58. Table showing the salaries of the Otago teachers, (*a*) at present, (*b*) as recommended by the Otago Board in connection with the supplementary grant (Mr. Harroway, Chairman). (Not printed.)
59. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, of Otago Education Board. (Not printed.)
60. Comparative table of staffs (Mr. Goyen).. .. 623
61. Statement of certificates held by teachers of the colony. (Not printed.)
62. The Supplementary Commission granting an extension of time for thirty days. (Not printed.)
63. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, South Canterbury District. (Not printed.)
64. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Marlborough District. (Not printed.)
65. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Hawke's Bay District. (Not printed.)
66. Statement presented by the Chairman of the Auckland City School Committee. (Not printed.)
67. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Auckland Education Board. (Not printed.)
68. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Wanganui District. (Not printed.)
69. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Nelson District. (Not printed.)
70. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Taranaki Education Board. (Not printed.)
71. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Wellington District. (Not printed.)
72. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers, 1899 and 1900, Nelson District. (Not printed.)
73. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Southland Education Board. (Not printed.)
74. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers, 1899 and 1900, Marlborough District. (Not printed.)
75. Return of teachers, salaries, &c , for the March quarter, 1901, Taranaki District. (Not printed.)
76. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving teachers, 1899 and 1900, Westland District. (Not printed.)
77. Return of appointment of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers, 1899 and 1900, Hawke's Bay District. (Not printed.)
78. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers, 1899 and 1900, Otago District. (Not printed.)
79. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Hawke's Bay Education Board. (Not printed.)
80. Return of amounts transferred from the General Account to the Building Fund during the years 1885–1901 by the Hawke's Bay Education Board. (Not printed.)
81. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers for the years 1899 and 1900, Taranaki District. (Not printed.)
82. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, South Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)
83. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers for the years 1899 and 1900, Southland District. (Not printed.)

Page

84. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Marlborough Education Board. (Not printed.)
85. Return of teachers in schools over 500 on average attendance, South Canterbury District. (Not printed.)
86. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Westland District. (Not printed.)
87. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Wanganui Education Board. (Not printed.)
88. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers for the years 1899 and 1900, South Canterbury District. (Not printed.)
89. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers for the years 1899 and 1900, North Canterbury District. (Not printed.)
90. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, North Canterbury. (Not printed.)
91. Maps of the various education districts, with position of schools. (Not printed.)
92. Statement abstracted from the London School Board Report for 1898 (Mr. C. Watson) .. 624
93. Return of schools supplied with caretakers' cottages, North Canterbury District. (Not printed.)
94. Return of teachers in schools over 500 average attendance, North Canterbury District. (Not printed.)
95. Return of teachers in schools over 500 average attendance, Hawke's Bay District. (Not printed.)
96. Return of teachers in schools over 500 average attendance, Southland District. (Not printed.)
97. Statement of the range of salaries for similar positions in the several education districts (Mr. Grundy) 625
98. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Southland District. (Not printed.)
99. Return of the amount transferred from the General Account to the Building Fund during the six years ending 1900, Marlborough District. (Not printed.)
100. Scheme of staffs and salaries, presented by Mr. H. Hill, B.A. 625
101. Return of teachers in schools over 500 in average attendance, Otago District. (Not printed.)
102. Statement of the annual cost of the Technical School, Wellington, from 1891 to 1900 (Mr. Dorset). (Not printed.)
103. Statement of the annual cost of cookery classes, Wellington (Mr. Dorset). (Not printed.)
104. Return of teachers in schools over 500 in average attendance, Wellington District. (Not printed.)
105. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers, Wellington District. (Not printed.)
106. Three tables relating to the issue of teachers' certificates (Mr. H. B. Kirk) 627
107. Complete scheme (C) of staffs and salaries on the basis of a £4 capitation (Mr. Hogben) 629
108. Scale and statements by the Inspectors and secretary, North Canterbury District. (Not printed.)
109. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Wellington Education Board. (Not printed.)
110. Scheme (D) of staffs and salaries on the basis of a capitation of £4 5s. (Mr. Hogben) 630
111. Return of teachers of schools over 500 in average attendance, Auckland District. (Not printed.)
112. Return of the appointments of teachers and the cost of relieving-teachers for the years 1899 and 1900, Auckland District. (Not printed.)
113. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Auckland District. (Not printed.)
114. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers for the years 1899 and 1900, Grey District. (Not printed.)
115. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Grey Education Board. (Not printed.)
116. Table showing the number of schools and number of pupils in each grade classified according to Mr. Hogben's scales C and D (Exhibits 107 and 110) 631
117. Table showing the number of schools in each grade classified according to Mr. Hill's scheme (Exhibit 100) 632
118. Scale relating to boys', girls', and infant schools attached to Mr. Hogben's Scale C (Exhibit 107) 632

Approximate Cost of Paper—Preparation, not given; printing (4,375 copies), £762 10s

By Authority: JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.