

24. Yes?—Yes, I think that is quite probable. I think it is quite proper. I think the desire of the Institute might be met by putting in a proviso that in future no Inspector shall be appointed of the rank of an assistant.

25. Your suggestion is that after a certain date—after the passing of the Bill—no future appointment should be made?—Yes.

26. With regard to dental and medical treatment, you say that the Institute thinks that that clause 131 is too drastic. Are you aware that it is not more drastic than the present English law?—Yes, personally I was aware of it, but I am not sure that the Institute was.

27. You notice the word “serious” there—“that such child is suffering from a serious disease or a serious bodily defect”?—Yes.

28. It only applies in those cases?—“Serious” is rather an ill-defined term, is it not?

29. I suppose that in construing the word “serious” a New Zealand Court would be guided by decisions in English Courts, would it not?—I presume so. The Chairman could tell you better.

*Mr. Hanan (Acting-Chairman)*: Yes, if it is the same statute and the same expressions are used.

30. *Mr. Hogben.*] Would you be prepared to acknowledge that it reduces it to cases that are really serious in a very strict reading of the term?—May I ask whether it means immediately serious or prospectively serious—I mean, threatening seriously the future development of the physique of the patient?

31. Now you are asking me for a legal opinion. We need not define it too closely, because there have been cases in England. In such cases has not the Hospital and Charitable Aid Board already a duty cast upon it to deal with cases of the kind?—I am not able to answer that.

32. Are you not aware that there is a duty cast upon the Hospital and Charitable Aid Board to deal with all really serious cases, and, if so, does not the Government already contribute?—I am quite aware that, at all events in the towns, the hospitals are available for parents who will make what one may call reasonable efforts on behalf of their children.

33. Did you see a case reported in one of the English educational journals where a child suffering from severe hip-disease was brought under this law?—I have not noticed that case.

34. Is it not within your knowledge that a hospital would have to deal with a case like that if the parents took the child to the hospital?—I have not much knowledge of hospitals, except the Wellington one, and I know they deal with any one who likes to go to them.

35. Do you think there is any hardship about this under those circumstances?—Speaking for myself, I am not able to say that I think there is; and, what is more, I think the matter in the minds of those who supported the proposal was the conditions in the country districts, where, generally speaking, attention is not so easily got.

36. This deals with serious cases?—Yes.

37. The Hospital Boards deal with country cases as well as town cases if they are serious, do they not?—I think so, but I could not say.

38. *Mr. Sidey.*] Were these resolutions carried with anything like unanimity?—Yes, I think practically all were carried unanimously except one or two. That one deals with the excision of clause 68 (1), dealing with the power of a Committee to recommend dismissal. That was not carried by a great majority—a majority of about seven or eight, I think.

39. The others were unanimous?—Yes, practically.

40. I gather from your remarks that you think the Committees should have nothing whatever to do with either the appointment or the removal of teachers?—Practically that is it.

41. You think they should not even be consulted?—So long as Committees are existent I do not see why they should not be consulted. I do not think it is a matter of great importance.

42. The sending of only one name down is practically taking away any power of consultation from them, is it not? It amounts to that?—Except this, that it allows an opportunity for a Committee which might know something to the decisive detriment of a candidate to say so—to give information; and if it has important information, and can back it up, it would be the Board's duty to take notice thereof.

43. But, speaking generally, you think, and the Institute thinks, that the Committee should have nothing to do with the appointment of teachers?—That is so.

44. Is not that also your opinion practically with regard to the Boards? Do you not suggest that a Dominion scheme of grading should be introduced?—That is so.

45. And that the Boards should be bound to take the teacher who is at the top of the grade for a suitable vacancy: is not that so?—Yes.

46. That would really be taking the power out of the hands of the Board, too, would it not?—Yes. Practically what we are working for is that our system be administered as a national system and not as a district system.

47. What you are working for is practically the wiping-out of Committees and Boards so far as the appointment of teachers is concerned: is that so?—Yes.

48. You would have them all appointed from Wellington?—Well, yes.

49. We have been told by a witness that in his opinion—and he was speaking from his experience in Auckland—that it would not be possible to have a satisfactory Dominion scheme. You do not agree with that?—No. You will not find many teachers who do.

50. I think the objection he raised was that it would not be possible for all the Inspectors to have a knowledge of the individual teachers throughout the whole of New Zealand sufficient to enable them to satisfactorily grade the teachers as against one another?—The reply that we make to that is that it is not found impossible to grade other services. The Railway service is a much larger service than ours, and it is graded. The Post and Telegraph service, I should think, is pretty nearly as large as ours, and it is graded. I do not see that it is necessary for every Inspector to know every teacher in the