

confirm everything he has said in regard to the Council of Education. Our opinion was that it would have been composed purely of expert advisers, that in its essentials it should have been selective rather than elective, and that the preponderating power on that Board would be the inspectorial power. We feel that strongly. In respect to the division of the district, we feel that a very grave injustice will be done to the teachers of the Waikato if the idea is carried out of subdividing the Auckland District into two. The trend of public opinion, as indicated by the recommendation of the Royal Commission, was strongly in the direction that the Boards should be widened and not limited—that the number should be five and not nine. We are in thorough agreement with the idea of making the Boards larger, but we see no necessity whatever why the Auckland District should be cut in two. Although we are aware that the Inspectors in conference gave a lead on this question, we do feel that the man most competent to speak on the matter, and who we are assured demurred at the Conference, is Mr. Mulgan. We feel, with his wide experience, his word should have carried very great weight in regard to the question of the number of Education Boards being nine. This Bill disturbs the already existing condition of affairs. We were not prepared for that disturbance, and instead of throwing upon those who disturb an already existing condition of affairs the onus of proving why it should be altered the Bill has thrown upon us the onus of showing why it should not be disturbed. A statement has been handed in to the Committee giving the reasons which actuated the Board in coming to the conclusion that the Board of Education of the Auckland District ought not to be divided into two parts. Another point we desire to bring forward is that we consider the Chairman of an Education Board should be paid an honorarium of not less than £200 per annum. That deals with the clause in the Bill which provides for a reasonable travelling-allowance being made to members of a Board. As to clause 29, dealing with the refund of members' travelling-expenses, the members of the Auckland Education Board feel that as their Chairman has to give up at least three days a week to his duties he should be allowed an honorarium not exceeding £200 per annum. The members of the Board are quite satisfied with reasonable travelling-expenses while on the Board's business, as at present, but the Bill provides that the allowance shall be on a defined scale, and that will be more satisfactory. The next point I wish to refer to is in connection with the voting-power of householders at School Committee elections; see clause 40. Our Board is strongly of opinion that extended powers should be given to the parents of children actually attending school by allowing the father and the mother double the voting-power of each householder. In regard to clause 54, we consider that the proviso in subclause (6) should be made mandatory. The Board is strongly convinced that the old drill system, which has been superseded of late by the system of physical instruction, was such a splendid preparation for the military training now in vogue and that the boys are to get afterwards, that they wish to see that clause made mandatory, and that military drill should be taught in the schools. Going back to clause 14, the Board is of opinion that it should be impossible for the number of urban members to exceed the number of rural members. Under the present Bill there would be six rural members on the Auckland Board, and four urban members representing the towns: that is to say, when the number reaches 61,000 you would then have four urban members. That number has already been reached in Auckland. When the population reaches 121,000—and that number has very nearly been reached by Greater Auckland—you would at once have six urban members, which means that the urban members will possibly at times outvote the rural members. I am a rural member at present. The reason why they will probably outvote the rural members is that it is possible that the six urban members can more easily attend the meetings of the Board than the six rural members. When Auckland, however, reaches 181,000 of population, under the Bill it will have eight urban members as against six rural members. What is required is a distribution into counties by Act, and the rural areas should be safeguarded to that extent. In point of fact, the Board would suggest that the number of rural members should at times slightly outweigh the number of urban members. In connection with clause 75, subclause (2), we suggest that after the words "a teacher" should be inserted the words "or Inspector."

*Hon. Mr. Allen:* In clause 127 we have made that alteration.

*Witness:* Thank you. As to clause 127, I would contend that the salaries of Inspectors are not sufficiently high, and the Board considers that the work of the Inspectors is of such great importance as to warrant the payment of every Inspector of Schools on a higher basis than that of the most highly paid teacher in the service.

3. *Hon. Mr. Allen:* To every Inspector?—Of every Inspector of Schools having full inspectorial power. I am contemplating the Inspectors as we understand them in the Auckland Province at present. It may be that you are going to establish special Inspectors, allotting them special duties.

4. What is the salary of the lowest paid Inspector in Auckland?—They range from £400 to £450. We regard the education of the young as a matter of the highest importance in the interests of the State, and therefore that the highest officer in the Education Department should be paid on exactly the same basis as the heads of other Departments. As to clause 155, we think that the proviso limiting the subsidies payable under paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) should be deleted, because limitation in subsidy may lead to limitation of bequests. I see no reason why if money is given in the shape of a voluntary subscription the subsidy should be limited to £250 and £500 respectively in the case of the gifts of land and of bequests. The last point I wish to call attention to is the schedule on page 66—Schedule VI, Part II, section (c). We suggest that Boards have power to establish separate infant schools with a minimum attendance of fifty-one. The minimum is fixed at 161 in the schedule. That is a question affecting the Board's policy, and we have established in Auckland in recent years a very large number of schools on the basis indicated in clause (a) of the Sixth Schedule. We feel that had we had the power, instead of establishing schools of that type we would have established separate infant schools. We believe it