

conveyance of children to school, no specific provision is made in respect of the payment of the cost of such conveyance. Salaries of pupil-teachers and probationers: The salaries provided for pupil-teachers and probationers do not offer sufficient inducement to young people, especially males, to enter the teaching profession. The Board suggests that the rates should be equal to those paid to cadets in any other department of the Public Service. Quorum of the Board: That a quorum of the Board should be half the total number where the latter is an even one, and a majority where the total number is an odd one. Salaries of relieving teachers: That the provision of section 75, subsection (8), which fixes the salaries to be paid by Boards to relieving teachers, cannot be given effect to unless an increased grant be made to Boards for the purpose.

3. *Mr. Hogben.*] You said that so far as Grade VIIIc is concerned an actual reduction in the staff is proposed. I might inform you that there is a misprint, one assistant teacher of Grade I has been missed out in column (5) and one teacher too many inserted in column (6)?—That will be all right then.

4. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] In regard to the centralization of the inspectorate, is that the only reason you have to suggest?—No, I am prepared to amplify that.

5. What other reason have you?—I am prepared to say that it is a retrograde step. We claim in New Zealand to be in advance of the Mother-country even in the matter of provision for education. It has been the principle adopted from the outset of our Act in New Zealand to have the Inspectors as officers practically of the Boards. That principle is being now brought into operation or has recently been brought into operation in England. It is true there are departmental Inspectors, but the local authorities have their own Inspectors, and they are the officers responsible for education being properly conducted. Another thing is that the removal of the Inspectors from being officers of the Board and centralizing them will have the distinct tendency to reduce interest in education. In Canada at the present time the effort is being made to stimulate local interest, and the experience we have had in New Zealand has been this: that the local interest given to education by reason of having the Inspectors under the Boards had caused a wider interest to be taken in the matter of education than you could get under any system dominated from any one particular centre.

6. Do you consider the local interest is created by the inspectorate?—Local interest is largely helped by the Inspectors. We have found in Otago on very many occasions that little troubles arise, particularly in the outlying districts, possibly between the parents and the Committee, and by the Board being in a position to send the Inspector to the district and bring the parties together trouble has been avoided and a better feeling created in the community.

7. What would prevent that being done under a centralization of the inspectorate?—Because the Board would not have authority to despatch the Inspector.

8. Does the Bill say so?—No, it does not; but the only Inspector provided under the Bill who will come in contact at all with the Board is the Senior Inspector.

9. Does the Bill say that?—The Bill says that the Senior Inspector is to advise. It does not mention anything in connection with the Boards and other Inspectors.

10. Have you read the Bill?—I have, but I am speaking from memory.

11. See clause 128, subclause (3)?—Yes. [Clause read.]

12. Does not that cover every point you have been referring to?—No, I do not think it does.

13. Are you aware whether or not all the Boards in England have Inspectors of their own?—I know a number of the controlling authorities have their own Inspectors.

14. I want to know whether they all have?—I cannot say if all have.

15. What are the functions of the Inspectors at Home?—There are two sets of Inspectors at Home.

16. I want to know about the Inspectors for the local authorities: what are their functions?—They have the general oversight. I think they are generally responsible to the local body for the management of education.

17. Are you quite sure of that?—Yes.

18. And if some other witness says that is not so, will you deny it?—If he produces something more than his own word—some documentary evidence—I will not.

19. In regard to the salaries of Inspectors, what are you paying in Otago to your Inspectors?—The Chief Inspector is paid £550, two Inspectors £475, and a Junior Inspector £425, and he will get an annual increment of £25 until his salary reaches that of the others.

20. Do you know that one Education Board district is paying its Inspector £700 a year?—That is Auckland. It is a very much larger district.

21. Are you satisfied that there should be that difference between the salaries of Chief Inspectors in the various districts?—No, I do not think that is the right thing.

22. How are you going to get over it if we do not centralize them?—You are not proposing even now to have one Chief Inspector for each of the education districts you are proposing to set up. There will be under your own scale of salaries a difference.

23. But would not the salaries be graded under the Bill?—Yes, certainly.

24. Is there any equity, uniformity, or justice about the salaries of the Inspectors now in the various Education Board districts?—It is not equitable, and that is consequent upon having so many Education Boards.

25. Well, is your district a very small one?—No.

26. Then why do you not pay a better salary?—Our district is not as large as Auckland by a long way, and the amount of money granted to us by the central Department is not so great. The payment to Inspectors is largely governed by the payment made by the Department. It is another form of the absurdity of paying upon the *per capita* grant, the same as the absurdity of paying teachers upon the number of children in the schools.

27. Is your district as large as Hawke's Bay?—Yes.