

possibly decide between the candidates, how can a totally inexperienced and in some cases unfit Committee judge between the candidates? It leads once more to the oft-repeated declaration of the teachers that nothing will give satisfaction to them until their appointments are decided by a system of grading—grading as to efficiency and service. It comes in at every turn of a discussion on educational matters. Salaries or sick-leave or removal expenses, the growth of a school or decline of a school—every aspect of the service brings this same point into view. For that reason we ask that that provision that not more than three names be sent to a Committee be deleted, and that the Board be called upon to make the appointments. Further, that a step forward towards a Dominion scheme of appointments should be made in this way. Portion of the paragraph with regard to appointments in our resolutions reads, "The Institute urges that all appointments of teachers be made from a Dominion graded list, to be drawn up on the basis of efficiency and service, and supplied to Boards for the purpose of determining appointments." The meaning of that is that when we look at the section of the Bill dealing with general powers there is power for grading teachers, and apparently the first grading-list is to be compiled by next June. I would like to ask if that is the correct reading of that clause.

*Mr. Hogben:* It could not be a Dominion grading-list by next year.

*Witness:* Well, there is an ambiguity.

*Mr. Hogben:* There is no inconsistency. The grading-list next June would have to be drawn up as far as it was possible, and it could not possibly be finished by next June. It means that eventually it will be a Dominion graded list. It will be possible to issue a grading-list, say, for districts such as Auckland.

*Witness:* We were in doubt about the matter. What we are asking for is that this graded list shall be supplied to the Boards, and the Boards shall make their appointments from that list—that is to say, we are asking to have the optional powers of Boards largely reduced, and the system that is in force in Wanganui, Auckland, and Taranaki adopted for the rest of the country. Then, in regard to transfers, the Institute suggests that the following be added to section 67: "(d.) In any case where an alteration of the grading of a position would result in the promotion of any teacher above another senior to him and equally efficient." That is, the promotion should be made according to the graded list for the district, and not in accordance with the existing staff at any school. It is claimed that because the school grows the teacher ought not necessarily to have to grow with it, but that other teachers within the district have as much claim to consideration as any one who happened to be in a fortunately situated school. We hope that they will be treated equally according to their value as teachers. Then, in regard to dismissals, the Institute urges that subsection (1) of section 68 should be deleted. That section gives the Committees the right to recommend to Boards dismissal, suspension, or transfer of a teacher. We enter a strong protest against that. We feel that a teacher should not be subjected to possible animus. There may not be one case in a thousand where local animus may be said to act in the removal of a teacher who has failed to make himself agreeable to certain people. It does not apply to others. The local Postmaster or the local policeman is not subjected to it, and we ask that that be deleted. The argument was raised that you must give to the community the right to protect itself against the fortunately rare cases of the thoroughly bad man or woman getting among the children. That is a reasonable enough objection, but we hold that it can be met in other ways. I think the clause in the Act is not needed. If a bad man gets there he will be marked and disposed of in the same way as he would if he were the local policeman or local postman. The Public Service is too well organized and too well administered to need that clause. It is a kind of threat. It places in the hands of possibly maliciously-minded persons a power which we think they ought not to possess, and seeing that it has a very limited application we think it might very well be cast aside. With reference to manual instructors, the Institute suggests that instructors employed solely in the manual training of primary-school pupils should be classified as primary-school teachers for the purposes of salary, to be rated as teachers, and paid accordingly. Now, in regard to Inspectors, the Institute considers the salaries offered for Inspectors are insufficient. It holds that the office of Inspector should be one to which the highest rank of teacher should be able to aspire—that is to say, those who are best placed presumably because of their past service in teaching should be available to be drawn upon for Inspectors when required, and therefore the Institute recommends that the salary of an Inspector should be not less than the combined salary and house allowance of head teachers. The Bill provides £490, and the Institute recommends that not less than £500 be provided for Inspectors, and that they rise by regular increments up to £650. It also recommends that the line in the clause dealing with Assistant Inspectors be omitted, and that no Assistant Inspectors be appointed. I took upon myself to quote to the Institute the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Allen in introducing the Bill explaining what that line meant, but it was felt that the retention of it might leave the Board open to possibly inadvisable practices and acts, and it was decided to ask that it be omitted altogether. Further, we suggest that there should be an Inspector for every fifty schools. I have taken the trouble to work out the number existing at present. There are now, I think, thirty-nine Inspectors. This proposal will require forty-four Inspectors. The present inspectorial staff is most unevenly worked. These figures will show the need for the centralization of the inspectorate. In Auckland there is one Inspector for sixty-seven schools, in Taranaki one for forty-seven, Wanganui one for fifty-one, Wellington one for forty-two, Hawke's Bay one for sixty-six, Marlborough one for ninety-three, Nelson one for sixty-two, Grey one for thirty-three, Westland one for thirty-four, North Canterbury one for fifty-five, South Canterbury one for forty-two, Otago one for sixty-one, and Southland one for sixty. That shows the great unevenness of the work of the Inspectors. With forty-four Inspectors, and paid at the rate suggested, the cost for inspection would be about £10,000 more than at present. The Inspectors are