

more than that. We are merely dealing with the inspectorate as an inspectorate. Personally, I think those cases ought to come into that list and ought to get at least that salary.

14. *Mr. Sidey.*] I suppose you agree that the principle of the Bill is the centralization of Inspectors?—We are not here on matters of policy, but I distinctly disagree with the proposal, and have always voted against it at the Conferences of Inspectors. Of course, I am speaking personally when I say that.

15. You do not know to what extent your opinion is shared by the other Inspectors in New Zealand?—I think you should ask the other Inspectors. The motion at the Conference was not carried; it was shelved last time.

16. Do you not think it would conduce to uniformity of standard?—It depends upon what you mean by "uniformity of standard." I do not think it would any more than at present.

17. *Mr. Poland.*] You know the Bill provides for a limited number of Inspectors, not less than two nor more than five?—Yes.

18. Also a number of Senior Inspectors?—Yes.

19. That means that only a limited number will be able to receive that salary of £500 to £625?—That is only in the Bill and not the Act. That can be altered, of course.

20. Do you think that that limited number of Inspectors is anything like a fair number to receive the salaries provided in the Bill for the whole of New Zealand?—No, I do not think so. Our contention here will bear that out.

21. Do you not think, seeing that only possibly two and certainly not more than five Chief Inspectors are to be appointed, that your proposal of £650 as a maximum is a very modest one?—Yes. You will find that the Auckland Inspectors have asked for a higher amount. We certainly think it is a very modest proposal. We have taken as a guide the resolutions passed at the Conference and also the salaries provided in the B (Professional) Division of the Public Service Act, which begins at £500.

22. Are you not of opinion that the services of a Chief Inspector in New Zealand, with a status such as under this Bill, that his duties are worth more than that of an architect to a Board?—Yes, unquestionably. Some architects get £700.

23. Can you give the Committee an opinion as to whether the Inspectors approve of the proposals under this Bill for the payment of salaries to be based on the average attendance?—I am not prepared to give anything but a personal opinion. We have not considered that at the Conference. I cannot say I have examined the clause sufficiently.

24. *Mr. Hogben.*] In regard to clause 127, this is what the Minister has promised: "No such Inspector shall receive a salary less than the salary he was receiving at the commencement of this Act"; and if we put in the words "and allowances" it would cover the case of No. 6?—We are bringing these cases forward so that the Committee will know the position.

25. *Mr. Malcolm.*] In regard to clauses 5 and 9, do you take it for granted that the Inspectors must be drawn from the ranks of headmasters?—I cannot give you a definite answer as far as the Conference is concerned. I think we are pretty well unanimous in saying that we think they should be.

26. Do you consider a man who has been headmaster at a school for a number of years is as well acquainted with small schools in country districts as a man who has had actual experience?—I think when you deal with such applications you always look at the man's whole experience. It is a question of organization. As Inspector he would have to supervise.

27. I am speaking of a man who has been a long time in a large school. I suppose you know that such men sometimes forget how to draft a time-table for a small school?—Yes, but each case would be considered on its merits.

28. If you have a young man who has plenty of merit, and of good standing and degrees, it may be advisable to accept him although he has not a headmaster's experience in a large school?—Yes, decidedly, but he should be appointed at £525. I do not object to that for one moment, but he should get the salary for the position. It necessarily places him in the position to supervise the work of the headmaster.

29. You say "necessarily places him in the position of supervising the work of the headmaster." Must he necessarily be called upon?—When I used the term "necessarily" I think you will find that circumstances will arise where that will be.

30. You admit that it would be possible to so organize affairs that he would not necessarily be called upon?—No, I do not admit that. Our experience of the districts is against that.

31. In order to keep poorly paid Inspectors in the service—men whom one would imagine were not highly qualified and therefore not very highly paid—in order to keep them in the service would it not be possible to arrange that they should have the inspection of schools in the outlying districts?—That would be detrimental. When I answered you "necessarily" I meant as things are at present. My main contention is that we wish that to be laid down as a general principle. You know Parliament will not be ready to take up another consolidating Bill in a hurry. We are not objecting to adjustment, but what we are asking for is that in the schedule setting out the position of Inspectors the principles we are laying down here should be included. If there is any saving clause such as you suggest it should go in as a saving clause and meet our adjustments. We do not wish that to be lost sight of. An Inspector should get £500 to begin with. We contend that this Assistant Inspector, put into this schedule at present for the reasons you are stating now, which are quite reasonable, will remain in perhaps as a general principle. That is the point.

32. *Mr. McCallum.*] The position of Inspector is one of the plums of the teaching profession?—Yes.