

8. Now, the Te Aute school and similar schools have not been brought under the Secondary School Act of 1903: Was that Act framed during your term of office?—Yes.

9. Do you know why they were left out?—They were left out because they are not endowed secondary schools within the definition laid down. They are not directly subject to inspection. They are only incidentally subject to inspection. For instance, Te Aute is subject to inspection as far as regards Government scholars, but not otherwise. We inspect them by courtesy of the authorities. They are very anxious we should inspect them. It is the same with Wanganui. I go to Wanganui, but Wanganui is left out of the Secondary Schools Act.

10. The Secondary Schools Act was repealed by "The Education Act, 1904," but it is incorporated in it: I understand from you that the Department wishes to bring these schools into line?—I think as far as possible. I am not exactly speaking with the authority of the Minister when I say that. I am speaking my own individual opinion.

11. You think it would be better to bring them into line with the general scheme of education in the colony?—Only into line with the general education scheme of the colony; not necessarily into line with regard to management and control.

12. I am referring only to the teaching?—Yes, I do. I think, for instance, in regard to teaching, that the provisions of section either 90 or 91 should apply to them.

13. Do I understand that it is your individual opinion they should be brought into line as regards the teaching?—Yes; there should be a scheme for them as suggested in the sections I have referred to.

14. Do you think it would be desirable to bring these schools under the provisions of section 84 and the subsequent sections of the Education Act, so as to make them secondary schools under the Act, and subject to the Act as to scheme and arbitration in the event of a dispute?—I do not know whether the Legislature would agree to bring them under these sections, because they involve certain grants. Wanganui and all schools under the control of church bodies were cut out.

15. Leaving the control as it is, because I understand you have no desire to oust the trustees in any way, so far as the property vesting in them and the general control of the school and the financial management are concerned; but do you think that the scheme of education should be subject to the general policy of the Education Department under the Act of 1904?—Yes; that is quite true. I understood you to ask me whether they should be subject to section 84 and subsequent sections, and, of course, section 87 gives grants according to the schedule.

16. I am referring generally to the provisions of the Education Act relating to secondary schools as regards the scheme, and in the event of a dispute, arbitration: is it your opinion that it would be desirable to bring these schools under the Education Act as regards these two points?—Yes. I should modify that section in such a way as to say this: the scheme of instruction should be sent by the trustees, who take the place of governors, for the approval of the Minister. If the Minister approved it, then it would mean that the trustees and the Minister agreed as to the scheme of instruction. If they do not agree I think there should be a Commission. It seems to me that the Commission set up under the Act, not as to the *personnel* exactly, but as to the general constitution of it, is about as good as you could make it. It was framed in a sort of way on the lines of the Endowed Schools and Charity Commissioners Act of the Old Country, and it gives the power to the governors—in this case the trustees—to nominate one person, and to the Minister to nominate one person, only in this case the person is named—the Inspector-General of Schools, who represents the Department—and a third person who is outside either—in this case the Chancellor of the University of New Zealand for the time being is named. These three shall form a Commission. They draw up a scheme, and their scheme in the case of Great Britain, and somewhat similarly here, as soon as it is published or laid on the table of the House becomes the scheme. I think that would be a very reasonable way.

17. So that if this school had been under this section of the Education Act any dispute between the Department and the trustees as to the scheme of education would have been settled by arbitration in the manner prescribed by the Act?—Yes.

18. You think that is a desirable state of things?—I think it is. There is a representative on each side, and there is an impartial person. I think the Chancellor of the University is a better person, generally speaking, than, say, the Chief Justice, because the Chancellor of the University of New Zealand by virtue of his office is presumed to know something about education.

19. Do you know why these schools have not been brought under section 90?—It is rather hard to go into the mind of the Legislature.

20. When the Secondary Schools Act was drafted, do you know why these schools were left out?—I do not know to what extent I can go into confidential relations between myself and the Minister. I can give the reason given in the House, and that seems to me to be sufficient to explain the action of the House. It was that they were under denominational control, and the House of Representatives declined to discuss anything that would put schools under denominational control in the position of receiving grants under section 87.

21. Have you or your Department any complaint to make about the trustees with respect to their management of the estate, in regard to leasing, and so forth—I mean outside the question of teaching?—I do not think the Department has really officially any knowledge of the management. I think it is a weak point that it has not. The Wanganui and other trusts send every year to the Department a full statement of their receipts and expenditure in the same way as the secondary schools under the Act send theirs. So in the case of Wanganui we know exactly what funds they have and how they dispose of them. That seems to me a businesslike way of managing the trust. There is no supposition in the minds of any person in the Department that the estate at Te Aute has not been managed otherwise than for the benefit of the trust and the objects of the trust; but I cannot help feeling that the procedure has not been exactly businesslike. Considering it has a Crown grant, there should be an annual publication of accounts, and all the business should be managed in a public way customary to public bodies.