

studies, and the salary paid is not commensurate. It is true they are fitting themselves for promotion, but they are also fitting themselves for the State's work. The State wants their assistance; and if the State is to develop, as every good citizen hopes it will develop, the State must have their assistance, and to get it it will have to pay for it. I think that when you consider the unattractiveness of a good many years of a young teacher's life you will see that what I have said is not too much. They have to seek for employment. They have no guarantee of employment when they come out of their training-college course. It is true they are almost sure to get a place, but it is also true that they have—a great proportion of them—to take very unattractive places at first in order to prove their worth for promotion to better. There is one other paragraph I have to deal with—a paragraph at the end of our statement. It is a kind of general summarizing of the reasons that the Institute has for asking for a more national point of view in regard to education. It asks that education be looked upon as a part of national development—as much as land-settlement and railway-construction—and contends that it is just as worthy of the investment of the nation's capital as any of those other avenues of national activity.

4. *Mr. Hanan (Acting-Chairman).*] It is reproductive?—Reproductive in the highest sense—more reproductive, we are taught by the wisest men we have, than any other investment the State can make.

5. *Mr. Hogben.*] In regard to appointments, dealt with on page 2 of your memorandum: do you notice that in clause 67, subclause (5), it is provided that the Board shall, before making an appointment, consult with the Senior Inspector?—Yes.

6. What would you say would be the basis on which the Senior Inspector would found his advice in regard to the teachers—I mean the teachers not only from that district, but from other districts?—We are like birds that sing the same song—we always come back to a grading system.

7. Never mind a grading system. I refer to the Bill. Would it not be a graded list that the Senior Inspector would have to be guided by almost entirely?—We are assuming that the Inspector knows his duty. We are not prescribing his duty to him. We are assuming that he knows his duty, and that he will have a graded list.

8. He will be an officer of the Department under the Bill?—Yes.

9. And the Department naturally will expect him to be guided by the Dominion roll, so to speak?—Exactly. We are assuming so. Beyond the possibility of sending three names to a Committee the appointment rules proposed in the Bill are absolutely satisfactory to teachers.

10. Is that subclause (7)?—Yes.

11. You propose to delete subclause (7) and not allow a Committee any voice, even where there might be some local considerations of which the Committee might know, possibly, better than the Board?—It is the local consideration that we fear. I can give you a fearful instance from Wellington City—quite a recent instance.

12. You think there is danger in that subclause (7)?—Certainly.

13. Supposing that a teacher does miss an appointment in one case, do you think it is likely there would continue to be three candidates? Do you not think that in the next case he probably would be the only candidate?—I do not think there is any likelihood of there being three candidates at all, with a wise inspectorate to do the grading.

14. You think that subclause (7), then, would not really have much effect?—I do not think it would have any effect, except that it might leave the way open to abuse on occasion.

15. Do you not think that by leaving it in the Committees would feel that they still had something?—Nearly all the best members of Committees that I know say they should have nothing to do with the appointments. It is not nearly so highly prized a privilege among members of Committees as I used to think, and as a good many people still think.

16. You say they should have no voice, but you would still consult them—that is to say, inform them of the appointment the Board intended to make?—I do not see any objection to that.

17. Now, with regard to clause 68 (1), which you say should disappear, does it not sometimes save time if the Committee, knowing of the impending resignation of a teacher, informs the Board, at the same time as it informs it of the resignation, that in its opinion another teacher is fitted for promotion, and makes a recommendation accordingly? Would not that save a good deal of time? The Board would not have to go through the whole process of consulting the Committee?—It might save some time, but it might be at the expense of some teacher who is perhaps equally qualified for that place, and perhaps has a better right, or some family or personal need.

18. The Board is not obliged to follow the recommendation of the Committee, is it?—No, but it might do so, because sometimes a Board wants to make itself amiable to members of Committees.

19. You are aware that some of the Inspectors are receiving considerably less than £500 a year now?—Yes.

20. There is one Inspector receiving £325 now?—I heard of worse than that some time ago.

21. This is two weeks ago—£325. There will be, at all events, an improvement of £25. Assuming that the benefits the Inspectors will get from examinations will be £30 that will make £355. Under the Bill the Inspectors become servants of the Department. Would you raise them from £355 to £500 at once?—I should look at the man. If the man is worthy and fit and qualified for an Inspector in every sense, yes; if not, put him back to teaching again.

22. The Department could not do that. The Bill secures to the Inspectors—at all events, at the outset—their places as Inspectors, does it not?—Yes.

23. Is it not conceivable that useful work might be found for them, and that they might learn their work in company with Inspectors of more experience as well as by going back into the schools?—I agree. I see the point. You mean some of the Inspectors who might be called junior Inspectors?