

*Mr. J. Allen:* Then he gets no increase.

*Hon. Mr. Fowlds:* Oh, yes! His school is reckoned a grade higher.

*Mr. J. Allen:* Will you make that clear in the Bill?

*Hon. Mr. Fowlds:* I do not think there is any doubt about it.

*Mr. Hogben:* I do not see it in that way.

*The Chairman:* It is open to two interpretations.

*Hon. Mr. Fowlds:* I think that is what it means. I do not want to commit myself. I will look into that. My own feeling is that it is the right thing to do. The idea is that his school is a grade higher.

*Mr. J. Allen:* There is no alteration in the Third Schedule.

*Hon. Mr. Fowlds:* The house allowance increases by more frequent rises of £5 instead of by a few rises of £10; the minimum and maximum are the same.

WILLIAM FOSTER, Secretary to the Educational Institute, examined. (No. 2.)

*Witness* said he appeared before the Committee on behalf of the executive and of members of the Institute, of whom there were over two thousand. He congratulated the Minister on having introduced a Bill whose provisions attempted to solve some of the difficulties in our national system of education. One step in advance which the executive thought admirable was the elimination of the pupil-teacher system, which would strengthen the staff and make for greater efficiency. Another point in the Bill of importance was that annual increments were to be made to teachers' salaries, which would have the effect of steadying teachers in a position and would give them a feeling of hope. The introduction of an assistant when the average of a school reached thirty-six pupils was also a good feature in the Bill. There were alterations in the salary grades which the executive thought were very commendable, and they were pleased that the Bill recognised the hardships of the teachers of the smaller schools and took steps to ameliorate them. He had one or two suggestions to offer. His first suggestion was in relation to Grade 5. He suggested that in schools of 81 to 120 the assistant which it is proposed to substitute for a pupil-teacher be substituted at once, as usually in schools of this size the pupil-teacher had to take two standard classes. In regard to the increments in salaries, he had been asked to point out that some of the teachers would have to wait seventeen months before they received an increment—those appointed in July. The Institute suggested that the increments should be granted on the 31st December following the date of appointment. If this were conceded no one would serve more than twelve months without receiving an increment. Referring to section 7 of clause 7, he wished to know whether the present regulations governing the reduction would remain in force and govern that Bill.

*Hon. Mr. Fowlds:* There would be no reduction.

GEORGE MACMORRAN, representing the New Zealand Educational Institute, examined. (No. 3.)

*Witness* remarked upon the fewness of the boys who went to the teaching profession. In his twenty-five years' experience as headmaster of the Terrace School only one boy went direct to teaching. Out of forty or fifty pupil-teachers in all that time only one male came to him. In the past three and a half years not one lad had left him to go to teaching, while in the same time as many as ten had left him to go into various branches of the Civil Service. Amongst the lads were several of great promise, whom he should have liked to begin life in the schools. The pupil-teacher in the first four years received £160, or an average of £40 per annum; the Post and Telegraph cadet in the first four years received £290, or an average of £72. He could not avoid the conclusion that if they were to have good teachers they must make the profession more attractive during the period of apprenticeship.

*The Chairman:* Taking the Bill as a whole, you approve of it?

*Witness:* Undoubtedly.

*The Chairman:* Do you confirm what the previous witness said?

*Witness:* Yes. I agree entirely with it.

JOHN CAUGHLEY, Assistant at the Training College, examined. (No. 4.)

*Witness* deposed that he had read the proposals made in the Bill, and he considered that as a whole the Bill brought about a number of great improvements. It would strengthen the weak schools, and the additions to salary were put in the right places, where most needed. While approving of the principle of the increments, he thought it would take too long a time to get a total increment of £30. That amount in six years was not sufficient to meet the needs of the situation. He would like to point out that when a teacher left a school to take up a position in another school his removal expenses, if he were a married man, would amount to the total annual increment in his salary for the next three years, so that in three years he would be financially exactly in the same position as he was in when he left the previous position. In other Departments of the public service the removal expenses were paid. He suggested three increments of £10 instead of six increments of £5. The salaries of teachers were far too low, and the amount of the increases did not go so far as they should. In support of this contention he put in the following statement:—