

country. I believe that when the Inspectors are under one control and meet periodically and compare notes they will develop a national standard of inspection. The Inspectors will all be men of considerably more than average ability as teachers, we hope, and it will work satisfactorily.

51. You think it will be quite possible?—I am quite sure of it.

52. With regard to the size of districts, what is your chief reason for advocating large districts?—We desire as nearly as possible an approach to a national system—to the making of the whole country one district.

53. It is with a view of getting rid of the Boards altogether, is it not?—With a view to widening the area of operations.

54. Is it not entirely in the interests of the teachers?—No, certainly not. The teachers regard themselves as servants of the public, assisting in the development of the future citizenship of the nation.

55. What is your reason for urging that the districts be made larger than they are in the Bill?—Fortunately, I have just been fortified by a resolution from Auckland this morning. The reasons are these, that the circumscribed area leads to circumscribed views.

56. On the part of whom?—On the part of every one, both Boards and teachers and everybody else. The teachers have naturally their district only to look to. They shape their course to meet the requirements of their own particular district. It may be that in some cases that is not the wisest course to pursue. However, I think that is a fair way of putting it. The best teachers are selected by other districts where there is a better opportunity for promotion, and thereby the pupils resident in the small districts lose the services of the best teachers.

57. The arguments you have given me are arguments which almost all relate to the scope of the teachers. The benefit of the pupils is only interfered with because of the opportunity of appointing teachers?—That is not all. Of course, you cannot have schools without teachers.

58. Apparently the main reason is that there may be a wider field for the teachers for promotion, transfer, and appointment?—Also there is a wider field for the selection of teachers for pupils.

59. Supposing the appointment, transfer, and promotion of teachers was taken out of the hands of the Committees and Boards altogether and done at Wellington, would there then be any occasion or necessity for the enlargement of the education districts?—I think so. Take a most extreme case for example. You have Westland and Grey: you are going to wipe them out, fortunately. There there is a difference even across the river: on one side of the river there is a different educational ideal at work, as compared with the other; and it is to avoid that that we are urging the enlarging of those boundaries.

60. Do you think there would be sufficient work for the Boards and Committees to do if the whole of the appointment of teachers were done from Wellington?—Well, I cannot give you the Institute opinion on that—I can only give my own opinion. I do not know that we have discussed the amount of work that the Boards have to do.

61. What is your own opinion?—My own opinion is that there is not sufficient work now for the Boards to do as they are constituted. Most of the Boards' duties consist of minor matters of business which could be much more expeditiously and economically handled by local bodies.

62. Your personal view would be to wipe the Boards out?—As at present constituted, yes.

63. That would be logical, would it not?—It is the kind of logic that appeals to my mind.

64. It is the logical conclusion from the size of the districts. If it is necessary to reduce them to four, why is it not logical to wipe them out?—I used that argument in addressing the Institute, and I believe it was that consideration which caused them to carry the resolution. I am only expressing my own opinion.

65. Your Institute recommended striking out subclause (1) of clause 28?—Yes.

66. In regard to transfers, you are aware that is the existing law?—Yes.

67. Do you know of any case where that power of recommending dismissal, suspension, or transfer was abused?—No.

68. Was there any before the Institute when they made this recommendation?—No; at all events, no specific case was mentioned.

69. You suggest the inclusion of an additional clause in connection with the transfer of teachers where a school rises in grade: that is to say, where a school rises in grade, instead of the teachers in the school receiving promotion, the teachers at a distance who may be senior to them, if efficient, should receive priority. Would not that mean that quite a number of transfers would have to be made to give effect to that?—I think not necessarily so. It is only asking that the service be administered analogously with the other branches of the service. Take the Post Office: when a new servant is wanted, in grading the Post Office they do not always promote the staff on the spot at the time.

70. Clause 67 (b) reads, "In any case where the efficient conduct of the school appears in the opinion of the Board to require such transfer." Do you think that would be sufficient to meet the case you refer to?—I think it would be if the Board were alert enough to use its powers; but I think it should be expressly stated that the fact of one teacher being on the spot does not give him a claim to promotion. That is the point the Institute wishes to make.

71. *Mr. McCallum.*] What does the Institute say as to the centralization of the appointment of Inspectors?—It welcomes it whole-heartedly.

72. You believe in enlarging the school districts until you enlarge them out of existence?—I am not speaking for the Institute in saying that. The Institute has asked for larger districts than at present, even to reducing the number to four.

73. What are you going to leave the Committees to do finally? Supposing we enlarged the Boards out of existence, should their work be done by the central Department?—I can give you two opinions. The teachers are divided. A good many teachers say, "What is the good of Committees?"