

71. You know the Senior Inspector would represent the other Inspectors, would he not?—Yes, I understand that.

72. As to clause 59, subsection (1), which provides for a fine of 2s., is the law proposed to be altered in the Bill?—No, I do not think so.

73. Do you think subclause (1) of clause 68 is unnecessary? Might not a Board when it announced a vacancy recommend the promotion of another teacher in the same school?—This I take to be one of the most important matters that we have come to. So far as we are concerned, if a Board has selected the best teacher, why should there be so much machinery about getting him to a school? Machinery always means delay. This is a matter we have had practical experience of, and it is sometimes extremely difficult to get the teacher to his post at a convenient time. There is a great deal of delay.

74. Is not all that machinery for the purpose of securing the consultation of the Committee?—We do not see the necessity of consulting the Committee in such a formal way so far ahead.

75. But does not this clause clear that up?—Well, it may be necessary to provide that you are going to consult the Committee in this formal way, but as the Board actually makes the appointment why consult the Committee? I simply say, intimate to the Committee. Our experience has been that this consultation of Committees has led to a great deal of delay which has been unnecessary sometimes, and you secure nothing at all by it, because you send your teacher along all the same.

76. What do the Committees say to that?—We have had actual experience of this, and we know what the difficulties are, because we appoint the teachers exactly on the principle set out in the Bill.

77. In regard to clause 75, subclause (8), that only determines the rate of salary the relieving teacher is to be paid?—Yes.

78. Is there power under the law now for paying relieving teachers?—Yes, but not the full payment. We pay a certain allowance, but it does not cover the actual payment for that purpose.

79. It is the allowance you are referring to?—Yes.

80. There is no provision in the Act for that—that is to be done by vote of Parliament?—What we wish to see is that in every case the allowance should be made adequate. You now make the condition that he shall be paid the full salary.

81. That is the law now, and this is intended to make it clear. How did the Boards pay for it before 1903?—Just out of their funds, I think.

82. Do you not think they might pay for some of it out of their funds now? Do they get more funds now?—Yes. This adds an extra burden on the Board, because hitherto we have not paid the full salaries.

83. Do you know the Egerton case in England, in which it was decided that a teacher was entitled to the salary for holidays after he had been teaching for the term preceding?—I do not know of that case.

84. Do you know that some Boards do pay for January and some do not?—Yes.

85. Is it not as well that it should be a uniform practice?—The practice ought to be on the principle of equity.

86. Do you not think the practice ought to be in accordance with the English practice?—I would not go as far as that. I think December is a reasonable arrangement. We have to consider not only the teacher there, but the teacher coming.

87. But if paid for December and January is not the teacher paid for the school at which he was before?—You could not pay for two teachers during January filling the one post.

88. The difficulty arises when it is not uniform?—Yes, I understand that is the difficulty. Still, I think December is really the reasonable and equitable period.

89. You understand that the Wanganui Girls' College was overlooked—it would have to come under clause 86?—Yes, that is correct.

90. *Mr. Malcolm.*] In regard to clause 68, do I understand that you recommend that the Education Board make the appointment without consulting the Committee in any way?—Yes; not by consultation but by intimation.

91. And you found that work well in the Wanganui District?—We do as much as possible to keep within the four corners of the law. We tried to do it. It was with the utmost difficulty we were able to do it, because of unnecessary delays occurring.

92. And you are of opinion that if the Act simply required that the Board should intimate to the Committee, and did not appoint it, it would expedite the matter?—I am quite of that opinion.

93. *Mr. Sidey.*] Is your only objection to the Boards being consulted the question of delay?—Yes, I think that is practically the only objection we have.

94. *Mr. Malcolm.*] Is there not also the further objection that the Committee, if it considers it is entitled to a consultation in any way whatever, will attempt to assert that privilege?—Yes, I admit that is a practical objection to it.

95. *Mr. Guthrie.*] In regard to the question of the transfer of teachers, can you tell the Committee why the Board finds such a recommendation necessary?—Yes, I could give you instances. One of our teachers got a transfer from a Grade IV to Grade V school. He has been in his present position for three years, and he has not made up by his increments what he lost by his transfer. It will take him another year to do so. There is no doubt it is a very serious matter indeed. Teachers are not too well off, and if they have a railway and a coach journey to make and carry all their goods and chattels with them, break up their homes and make a new home, it is quite enough to put a teacher back to the extent of £25 or £30, and that takes up a great deal of the increment.

96. Will you tell the Committee the experience of your Board in the transfer of teachers to back-block schools?—That is a typical case I mentioned just now.

97. Speaking generally, does the same thing apply?—Generally it has borne very heavily on the teachers.