

Let us get rid of them." I do not say that myself. I say that this provision for local Committees is of great use, and there are splendid opportunities for Committees of the right kind. The only thing is that I am not quite sure that they ought to be rigidly limited to five, or seven, or nine in number. Sometimes three would do, and sometimes thirteen would be better. I myself can see a splendid opportunity for local enthusiasm and local assistance under that provision of the Bill.

74. But what would be their functions?—To generally foster and encourage social life, especially in the small communities, the building-up of the local libraries, correlating school life with social life, and making especially village and small-town schools a centre of social activity.

75. Do you think they are at all likely to take up those duties if they have no direct say in the appointment of the teacher or in the control of the school?—I think, for the working-out of that ideal, one of the essential points is that the teacher must be a free member of the community and not subject to the domination of any body in the community.

76. How long have you been a teacher?—I have nearly finished thirty-five years.

77. Are not your views and those of the Institute warped from the teachers' point of view? You know we have had many abuses of School Committees, and are not your views warped by a few bad cases you have had of School Committee work?—No, there is too much made of that. There are not many bad Committees, but the fact remains that there are not many that do anything effective. What I would like to see is a voluntary Committee of real enthusiasts in the cause of school-work, and thus give us an opportunity of educating the public to the value of education.

78. Do you think they will be educated without there is some inducement?—I think you have allowed the inducement by this proposal. That looks to me as an opportunity for great advance.

79. You object to allow Committees to recommend dismissal, &c., and you say you think there may be only one case of animus in a thousand?—That is so. I know of no special case.

80. Surely that goes in support of subclause (1) of clause 68?—Negatively, yes. But what we come back to is this: why should teachers be treated differently from any other public servant? Nobody has the right to recommend the local policeman for dismissal, or the Postmaster or Station-master.

81. Yes, the public have the right, and frequently use it?—They have got to go the proper way about it and to the proper authorities. The Public Service is guarded.

82. Do you object to the Committee being in the position of employer?—Yes, that is really the point. No other public servant but the teacher is the servant of any local body.

83. How can you say the teacher is a servant of the Committee—he is the servant of the Board?—But you know when you place a Committee in authority—

84. You do not want these Committees to push their chests out?—No.

85. You still want the Committees?—We have no reason to ask for their abolition. A good many of our members, of course, would like to see them abolished, but most of us would not, and I myself would most certainly not. I have had nearly thirty-five years' experience of teaching, and the whole of my experience with regard to Committees has been wholly satisfactory.

86. *Mr. Poland.*] Do you think that School Committees, without having the power of appointment or recommending the suspension of teachers, can do very useful work in any district?—I do.

87. And do you believe their work might be even more useful if this semi-control they have over the teachers was done away with altogether?—I think so.

88. Do you think it might create a little discontent for a little while amongst the Committees?—Yes.

89. But that it would die away when they had other duties?—Yes.

90. And you believe that the power which is given in this Bill of subsidizing local contributions would tend in that direction?—I believe so.

91. With regard to dental and medical treatment, your Institute believes that provision should be made by the Public Health Department for free dental and medical treatment for the children of parents in poor circumstances?—Yes.

92. Do you not believe that parents of children do a great deal of good to the State by rearing children, and that they have a great responsibility in this country as compared with those who have no children to bring up?—Yes, that is so.

93. When in addition to that they have a child with a serious bodily defect or with serious disease, do you believe it is the duty of the State, in the rearing of that asset to the State, to put that child into a state of healthy bodily condition?—Yes, I believe that. My own opinion is that if citizens are worth rearing at all they are worth rearing as well as possible.

94. And if parents have the misfortune to have a child with a serious bodily defect you think the State is not doing too much in putting that child into good bodily health?—I think the State is only doing its duty.

95. But at present that can only be done by the parents going to the Charitable Aid Board, and having it done as a matter of charity and not as a matter of right. Do you think it should be done as a matter of right?—I do not think I am inclined to quibble over the terms so long as it gets done.

96. With regard to the appointment of teachers, you do not agree that Committees should have the power of appointment, and you think appointments should be regulated by a Dominion scheme of grading. Is it not a fact that some Boards have given up the power of appointment practically?—Yes.

97. That is, they have put it into the hands of Inspectors?—Yes.

98. Has the position taken up by those Boards resulted well or ill for the teachers—has it given satisfaction or otherwise to the teachers?—I cannot say they are absolutely unanimous about it, because there was one vote against it. I was informed in Auckland last January that they have an