

11. Coming again to the North Canterbury District, are you aware that the establishment of technical schools in Christchurch would have been postponed several years if it had been left to the Board? Are you aware that the Board there in 1901 wanted to have nothing to do with technical education?—I do not think that could apply to the Wellington Board.

12. Are you aware of the fact?—No, I was not aware of it.

13. Do you think that would make a difference to the opinion of the Board?—Possibly it might.

14. Would it meet the case of your Board if in each of these instances—secondary and technical education—there was a proviso that the Education Board must be consulted?—Yes, I think it would.

15. With regard to section 7 of the Board's resolutions, dealing with clause 67 (3), is there anything to prevent the Board from appointing an assistant teacher as head teacher?—The Board so read that proviso at the top of page 28 of the Bill—"Provided further that no appointment of an assistant teacher to the position of head teacher in the same school shall be made under this subsection."

16. But does not that subsection relate entirely to transfer?—Truly, it does.

17. So it merely means that an appointment cannot be made by transfer; the Board must throw it open?—That is the case. It is not proposed to limit the right of the Board in regard to advertised positions.

18. Does it limit it?—No, that does not.

19. Section 7 (g) of your statement—"Termination of engagement"—clause 78 (1) of the Bill: does the Bill make any alteration in the law as it is at present?—No, but the Board suggests that the present law is not easily workable, in this way: a teacher may leave after a month's notice, but it very seldom happens that it can have his successor to enter on the duties within a month. That means a constant succession or a large number of temporary appointments. If the longer time, two months'—or, what would equally satisfy my Board, three months'—notice from either side might be required, that would permit of the appointee to a vacancy following immediately after the outgoing teacher, and would so reduce administrative cost and promote efficiency.

20. You say in section 8 of the Board's resolutions, "The inspection of schools, whether secondary or technical, can, the Board thinks, be advantageously and economically carried out by the present Education Boards." Have all the Education Boards Inspectors who are qualified to inspect secondary schools?—I am not aware whether they have, nor am I intimately enough acquainted with the qualifications of the present Inspectors in all the districts to express an opinion regarding all. The idea of my Board, however, is that, as under the Bill the education districts would be much larger, the inspectorate of the larger districts would be so strengthened as to enable such additional work to be efficiently undertaken. This evidently was the idea of the Commission of 1912, which recommended that secondary or technical schools should be placed under the control of the Boards. Looking at our district, we have established during the last ten years a district-high-school system which our Inspectors have inspected and developed with the sanction of the Board and of the Department.

21. Is the work of district high schools as high, in certain directions, as that of secondary schools?—Of course, it does not proceed so far. Your questions in regard to expert knowledge could perhaps with greater satisfaction be addressed to our Chief Inspector, who is present.

22. *Mr. Sidey.* Your Board disapproves of the creation of urban school districts: is that so?—Yes.

23. What is the chief reason why the Board disapproves?—We do not think that the various schools would get the keen personal attention that we know they at present receive from the Committees as they exist now. That is, a large school is managed by a Committee of nine members. We know that these members are elected by the parents, because they have a keen interest in the school. We have excellent Committees; they exert themselves to advance the interests of the school. Under the proposal in the Bill, if an urban area were created, instead of having seventeen Committees each containing seven to nine members and each watching the interests of the individual school, we should have one Committee which could not have to any school the personal relation and the personal interest which exist at present.

24. Have you considered the desirability of the introduction in an urban district of schools which would, for example, include only pupils of, say, the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards?—The Board has not considered that.

25. Might it not be an advantage to have a central school dealing only with the higher standards?—Quite possibly it might. That is a matter which we have not considered as a Board.

26. If it were considered desirable to do that, would it not then be necessary to combine some of the present school districts together? Would it not be necessary to unite some of the districts to carry out such a scheme?—Could not the Committee of the district in which the school is established manage the school? The Act does not restrict the area from which the pupils may be drawn; they may come from anywhere.

27. Would it not be necessary for adjoining school districts to unite if a central school were established which would take the higher standards?—I do not see that it would be necessary. We had in Wellington City some years ago two district high schools. It was unnecessary in the case of these to alter the school districts. The pupils came from all directions, from many different districts. That fact did not cause any trouble. In relation to the question of the union of districts, perhaps you are aware that many years ago the combined Committee district was tried in Dunedin and was abandoned.

28. I quite understand the advantage, from the point of view of preserving the local interest in the schools, of each school having its Committee; but I am asking you whether, if an alteration